DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 819 HE 024 668

AUTHOR	McFerron, J. Richard; And Others
TITLE	The Graduate School: Teaching and Research Support in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.; Indiana Univ. of Pennsylvania.; Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
PUB DATE	May 91
NOTE	317p.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Biological Sciences; Chemistry; College English; *College Instruction; College Mathematics; Deans; Department Heads; Departments; *Graduate School Faculty; Graduate Study; Higher Education; History; Intellectual Disciplines; Music; Political Science; Psychology; Research Methodology; Sociology; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This monograph summarizes the data from a study designed to evaluate how university deans, department chairmen and faculty view teaching related activities. A methodological problem which limited the analysis of a similar, earlier study prompted the development and execution of this research. An introductory section describes the earlier flawed study. There follows a description of the methodology for the current study: deans, department chairs and faculty were surveyed in nine disciplines within a national sample of colleges and universities; the study used a sample of 453 institutions and sent surveys to deans, departments chairs and faculty with 54 percent of deans and department chairs and 38 percent of faculty returning the survey (the final total was 142 deans, 392 chairs, and 1,172 faculty). In addition, to permit the testing of theories about differences among the disciplines, three disciplines were selected from each of the following areas: (1) the physical sciences (biology, chemistry, mathematics); (2) the social sciences (political science, psychology, sociology); and (3) the humanities (English, history, music). The bulk of the document consists of a series of tables presenting the data from the study. Many tables permit comparisons between disciplines. An index to the tables is included, and to assist in further research, the tables have been cross-referenced by category. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Graduate School

ED333819

TEACHING AND RESEARCH SUPPORT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

J. Richard McFerron
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
David M. Lynch
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Lee H. Bowker
Humboldt State University
Ian A. C. Beckford
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

HE 024 668

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

May 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lee H. Bowker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IUP

The University

Founded in 1875, Indiana University of Pennsylvania is the commonwealth's fifth largest university with more than thirteen thousand students from nearly every state and over sixty foreign countries. Located fifty miles northeast of Pittsburgh in the foothills of the Allegheny Mountains, IUP is one of fourteen universities in the State System of Higher Education.

IUP is big enough to offer a diversity of high-quality academic programs and has an outstanding faculty committed to teaching. The university includes six colleges and two schools and offers graduate programs in professional and applied areas as well as five programs at the doctoral level. More than a hundred major fields of study are available within the forty-five academic departments. IUP's internship program, the largest in Pennsylvania, provides students with on-the-job experience to supplement their classroom learning.

IUP is small enough to encourage individual growth and excellence. Acclaimed among the academic best in the nation, the university has been listed in **Barron's Guide to the Most Prestigious Colleges** as one of the 283 most academically competitive colleges and universities in the nation. **Changing Times** recognized IUP as one of fifty U.S. colleges with high academic standards and tuition and fees below the national average. **The Best Buys in College Education** by Edward Fiske, education editor of the **New York Times,** cited IUP as one of the 221 "best buy" colleges and universities in the nation. Only twelve Pennsylvania schools were chosen for the best buy list.

IUP is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution. Please direct inquiries concerning equal opportunity to Director of Affirmative Action, IUP, G-30 Sutton Hall, Indiana, PA 15705.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH SUPPORT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

J. Richard McFerron
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
David M. Lynch
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Lee H. Bowker
Humboldt State University
Ian A. C. Beckford
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

May 1991

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank Janet Wolfe for her help in producing this monograph. Robert France was helpful in organizing the data.

INTRODUCTION

Using grants obtained from the Lilly Foundation and from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE), the American Sociological Association created three task forces to study factors relating to excellence in college teaching. The third of these task forces was commissioned to study institutional factors in teaching excellence. As part of their work, they carried out three surveys: of deans of colleges in which sociology departments existed, of sociology department chairs, and of sociology faculty members. These surveys examined reports of teaching conditions from the viewpoints of these three pivotal role players on American college campuses. These surveys revealed rather different views of most teaching-related activities by the deans, chairs, and faculty. For example, 65 percent of the deans reported that reviewing and improving the curriculum would be recognized as a contribution toward a positive personnel action such as achieving tenure, promotion or a merit salary raise. In contrast, only 39 percent of both the chairs and faculty respondents believed this to be the case. When higher education institutions were broken down by type of institution, the disparity in opinions on this topic was found to be greatest in universities within which, for example, 74 percent of the deans indicated that reviewing and improving the curriculum would be taken as a positive factor in personnel actions, as compared with 58 percent of the department chairs in sociology but only 23 percent of the sociology faculty. Some readers might assume that this miscommunication about the personnel process in a university was due to the social distance between deans and chairs and faculty members, respectively, but this clearly was not the case. There was considerable evidence in the surveys of excellent communication in areas other than teaching. For example, exactly the same percentage of deans and sociology faculty in four-year colleges (59 percent) agreed that publishing an article in a refereed journal would be rewarded in personnel actions. Comparable percentages for deans and sociology faculty in universities were 87 percent and 84 percent. Bowker (1981) interpreted these data as indicating a gradient of ignorance, a decrease in the awareness of internal rewards and resources from deans to chairs to faculty members. He hypothesized that this gradient of ignorance was sometimes a deliberate self-control policy of the dean and at other times a result of lack of attention to communication between the dean and faculty members on matters considered by the dean to be relatively unimportant, that is to say, teaching. No matter what the intent, the effect of this gradient of ignorance was to maximize the dean's discretionary power and control over funding and access to other teaching support functions.

Further analysis with these data was limited because of a methodological weakness in the design of the research. All three samples--of deans, sociology chairs and sociology faculty--were drawn from the same institutional universe, but the returned questionnaires did not necessarily come from the same institutions. Questionnaires were simultaneously sent to the three groups of respondents at a national random sample of institutions, but return rates were not high enough to create a substantial overlap in the samples. Most colleges and universities contributed respondents to only two of the samples (such as a faculty member and a dean, but no department chair), so it was not possible to compare perceptions of parallel sets of deans, chairs and faculty from exactly the same institutions.

This monograph summarizes data from a study specifically designed to correct the methodological problem which limited the analysis of the American Sociological Association's data. Our solution was to mount a larger, more complex study in which deans, chairs and faculty would report on the same variables within the same period of time. The scope of the study was extended to investigate a total of nine disciplines within a national sample of colleges and universities. By progressively sampling constituents from the same institution, it was possible to guarantee that faculty were matched with the appropriate chair and dean, thus making it possible to draw stronger inferences about the operation of the continuum of ignorance and other teaching-related processes which may be occurring in America's colleges and universities.

This monograph consists of a series of basic tables illustrating the conditions of teaching in American higher education. Many of the tables permit direct comparisons among the nine disciplines included in the study. Each scholarly discipline represents an independent study in which we have data from exactly matched samples of deans, department chairs and faculty members. These nine disciplines enable us to gain a much fuller view of the conditions in American higher education than would be possible with data from a single discipline. Comparisons among disciplines are also possible, as are tests of theories about the differences among the disciplines, such as the Biglan hypothesis. To facilitate such theory testing, three disciplines were selected from each of the three major areas of American classical higher education: the physical sciences (biology, chemistry, mathematics), the social sciences (political science, psychology, sociology), and the humanities (English, history, music). Interpretations of the tables are not provided in this monograph. Instead, the monograph will serve as a source document for journal articles and papers targeted for scholars in each of the nine disciplines and for students of higher education in general. Our general goal is to enhance the participation of faculty in institutional governance by increasing their understanding of the continuum of ignorance, institutional role conflict, and normative confusion.

METHODOLOGY

The population under consideration is all the U.S. colleges and universities designated by the editors of the 1984 *Barron's Guide* (*Barron's Profiles of American Colleges*, 1984, 14th edition, Woodbury, NY: Barron's Education Services, Inc.). Institutions dominated by narrow specialties such as art, music or design were explicitly excluded from the population. Institutions with reported total student populations of less than 1,000 students were also eliminated from the sample.

Barron's Guide is organized by state with institutions being alphabetized within each state listing. A 50 percent sample of the 1,485 entries in the 1984 *Barron's Guide* was chosen by starting at the first entry and sequentially numbering the entries. Only the odd numbered entries were considered for the sample. After one pass through the guide, 743 numbered entries were available for sampling. Of these entries, a small portion were too small (less than 1,000 students) or too specialized (e.g. San Francisco

Art Institute, Ringley School of Art and Design, Savannah College of Art and Design, Westminster Choir College, Shenandoah College and Conservatory of Music) to be included in the sample. After eliminating 255 schools that did not meet the size criteria and 35 schools that did not meet the generality criteria, 453 institutions remained in the sample.

A stratified random sample of the remaining institutions was formulated to acquire an adequate number of responses from the larger institutions. One-third of the stratum containing the smallest institutions, half of the institutions in the intermediate stratum, and three-fourths of the large universities comprised the final sampling frame.

It was necessary to telephone each institution to acquire the name of the appropriate dean or deans. Depending on the organization of the institution, one or more deans should be appropriately canvassed. For instance, a smaller, more centralized academic administration typically has one academic dean, while larger, more specialized and diverse universities may have many deans heading separate colleges or schools. In liberal arts colleges, a single dean generally is responsible for all nine disciplines, while as many as three or four deans might have responsibility for these nine departments in large research universities. There were 265 deans in these institutions who had administrative responsibility for the nine disciplines of biology, chemistry, mathematics, English, history, music, political science, psychology, and sociology.

Fifty-four percent of the 265 deans returned usable questionnaires in which they identified the chairs of the relevant departments under their jurisdiction. A parallel instrument was sent to these chairs and a similar return rate of 54 percent was realized. In both cases, follow-up procedures were applied, which consisted of an additional mailing to each dean or chair who did not respond. The chairs, in turn, identified faculty members in their departments. Usable surveys were returned by 38 percent of the faculty members surveyed. The final samples consisted of 142 deans, 392 department chairs, and 1,172 faculty members. Of the 142 deans, 74 represented schools with two or more deans; and 68 are from single dean schools. Of the 113 unique institutions represented, 45 are institutions with more than one dean. Figure 1 details the sample sizes and return rates for the nine disciplines separately, as well as the aggregate figures for the total study.

Most of the questions in each survey instrument are duplicated in the other two questionnaires, which allows us to make direct comparisons of the reports received from deans, department chairs and faculty members on a wide variety of conditions related to teaching and research support. These comparisons can be made within each discipline, within institutional types, or for the nine disciplines as a whole.

The complexities of the initial mailings and the follow-up letters to deans, department chairs and faculty members were handled using a unique SPSSX program created by one of the researchers (McFerron, 1990). Although random sampling procedures were used throughout the study, sampling biases at each stage were magnified by the snowball sampling design that was utilized to obtain exactly matched samples.

Figure 1. Sample Sizes by Disciplines and Positions

		Chairs			Faculty		
Discipline	Deans*	Sampled	Returned	Rate	Sampled	Returned	Rate
Biology	32	94	48	51%	411	183	45%
Chemistry	39	86	59	69%	426	172	40%
English	26	92	44	48%	407	155	38%
History	27	91	43	47%	327	109	33%
Mathematics	33	87	47	54%	509	175	34%
Music	29	67	41	61%	312	98	31%
Political Science	19	63	26	41%	171	60	35%
Psychology	25	77	47	61%	286	116	41%
Sociology	25	67	37	55%	244	104	43%
Total	142 255*	724	392		3093	1172	

Return rates:

Deans = 54% Chairs = 54% Faculty = 38%

*Matched with chairs.

This multi-stage sampling design, the modest return rates, and the disproportionate stratified composition of the final samples make it necessary to be cautious in claiming that the data presented in this monograph are representative of the universe of American colleges and universities. However, we believe that these data provide a realistic view of teaching conditions in American higher education because of the consistency among the nine disciplinary sets in this study plus a similarly high degree of consistency between our results in this study, the original American Sociological Association's study, and three other studies of graduate deans, continuing education deans and chief liberal arts academic officers that we have completed in the past (Lynch and Bowker, 1984; Lynch and Bowker, 1985; Bowker, Lynch and McFerron, 1985).

Choosing the unit of analysis in a study depends on the goals of the study. In the current research, we had to choose among institutions, deans, departments (represented by department chairs), and faculty members. Faculty members were chosen as a unit of analysis because our greatest concern is the effect of certain administrative practices and arrangements upon the quality of teaching delivered in and outside of classrooms by these faculty members. Because we chose faculty members as the unit of analysis in the study, some chairs and deans are not unique individuals in the tables presented in this monograph. They are the deans and chairs who have been matched individually with faculty members, which means that a chair or a dean who is represented by two faculty members in the final sample will be counted as two chairs or two deans in a table that is based on faculty respondents. Put differently, respondents in the samples of deans and chairs are weighted differently from respondents in the faculty sample. When presented for comparative purposes, their weight is equal to the number of faculty members who are matched with them in the final sample.

VERIFICATION OF SAMPLE

Verification of the sampling methodology involved repeating the identification of the 1,485 institutions in the 1984 *Barron's Guide*. For each of the 453 schools in the 50 percent random sample, variables expressing highest degree offered (bachelor's, master's, doctorate), affiliation (private, public, church-related), number of undergraduate students, and number of graduate students, were gathered from the individual articles in *Barron's Guide*. These data were recorded on data sheets and subsequently entered into a data file. A chi-square analysis was run to determine the similarity between the population and the sample.

The chi-square goodness-of-fit analysis for highest degree, affiliation, and number of graduate students results in differences between the observed proportions and the hypothesized proportions that are not statistically significant at the .05 level. For total students the difference is not significant at the .005 level. The representativeness of the sample is confirmed. The demographic profile of the 113 institutions in the final sample is shown in Figure 2 through Figure 5. Figure 6 shows the departmental proportions in the final sample.

Figure 2. Institutions by Total Student Enrollment

	Frequency	Percent
2000 or less	26	23.0
2001-3000	23	20.4
3001-5000	18	15.9
More than 5000	46	40.7
Total	113	100.0

Figure 3. Institutions by Graduate Student Enrollment

	Frequency	Percent
None	28	24.8
1-500	32	28.3
501-2000	37	32.7
More than 2000	16	14.2
Total	113	100.0

Figure 4. Institutional Affiliation

	Frequency	Percent
Private-Independent	24	21.2
Church Related	27	23.9
Public	62	54.9
Total	113	100.0

Figure 5. Institutions by Highest Degree Offered

	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor's	27	23.9
Master's	51	45.1
Doctorate	35	31.0
Total	113	100.0

Figure 6. Departmental Proportions in Sample

	Chairs		Faculty	
Department	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Biology	48	12.2	183	15.6
Chemistry	59	15.1	172	14.7
English	44	11.2	155	13.2
History	43	11.0	109	9.3
Mathematics	47	12.0	175	14.9
Music	41	10.5	98	8.4
Political Science	26	6.6	60	5.1
Psychology	47	12.0	116	9.9
Sociology	37	9.4	104	8.9
Total	392	100.0	1172	100.0

ACCESSING THE TABLES

The next several pages index the tables included in this monograph. To assist in further research, the tables have been cross-referenced by category. Following the categorized index, the title of each table is listed numerically. Lastly, the bulk of the monograph consists of the tables themselves.

CATEGORIZED LIST OF TABLES

A. TEACHING LOAD

Table Title

1. Teaching Load by Discipline, Faculty Sample

2. Time Spent Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample

108. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Deans' Sample

109. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

110. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

111. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Deans' Sample

112. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Chairs' Sample

113. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Faculty Sample

114. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

115. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Deans' Sample

116. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

117. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Faculty Sample

118. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

143. Faculty Teaching Load by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

144. Faculty Teaching Load by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

198. Regression of Teaching Load on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

199. Regression of Percentage of Time Teaching on Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

200. Regression of Percentage of Time Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

201. Regression of Percentage of Time Spent Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

202. Regression of Percentage of Time Spent Teaching on Selected Deans' Assessment Variables, Chairs' Sample

203. Regression of Percentage of Time Spent Teaching on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

B. FUNDS FOR EXCELLENCE

General

59. Relationships Among Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

60. Relationships Among Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

61. Factor Analysis of Adequacy of Resources, Chairs' Sample

62. Factor Analysis of Adequacy of Resources, Faculty Sample

88. Relationships Between Selected Resource Adequacy Variables and Dean's Ratings of Departmental Teaching Quality

91. Relationships Between Selected Resource Adequacy Variables and Dean's Ratings of Departmental Research Quality

119. Resource Adequacy by Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Faculty Sample

188. Adequacy of Full Professors' Salaries by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Deans' Sample

197. Regression of Professors' Salary on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Teaching

6. Funds for Offering Courses Often Enough by Discipline, Faculty Sample

7. Funds for Sabbaticals to Improve Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample

107. Relationships Between Teaching Variables and Formal Rewards

135. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

136. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

137. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

138. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

139. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

140. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

175. Relationships Between Formal Rewards for Teaching and Resource Adequacy

176. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Deans' Sample

177. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

178. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

179. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Deans' Sample

180. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

181. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

Research

3. Funds for Travel to Conferences by Discipline, Faculty Sample

4. Funds for Research by Untenured Professors by Discipline, Faculty Sample

5. Funds for the Purchase of Library Journals by Discipline, Faculty Sample

120. Adequacy of Resources for Grants Travel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Grants, Faculty Sample

121. Adequacy of Resources for Grant Development Personnel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Grants, Faculty Sample

122. Adequacy of Resources for Travel to Develop Grants by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Deans' Sample

123. Adequacy of Resources for Travel to Develop Grants by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Chairs' Sample

124. Adequacy of Resources for Grant Development Personnel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Deans' Sample

125. Adequacy of Resources for Grant Development Personnel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Chairs' Sample

126. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

127. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

128. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

129. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

130. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

131. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

132. Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

133. Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

134. Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

182. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Deans' Sample

183. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Chairs' Sample

184. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

185. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Deans' Sample

186. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Chairs' Sample

187. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

C. TENURE

General

26. Reports of Tenure Weights, by Position

46. Relationships Among Tenure Weights and Merit Salary Awards, Deans' Sample

47. Relationships Among Tenure Weights and Merit Salary Awards, Chairs' Sample

48. Relationships Among Tenure Weights and Merit Salary Awards, Faculty Sample

56. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Deans' Sample

57. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Chairs' Sample

58. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Faculty Sample

145. Relationships Between Selected Tenure Weights and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

Teaching

8. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample

49. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

53. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Faculty Sample

54. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

99. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

146. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

147. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

148. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

149. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Deans' Sample

150. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Chairs' Sample

151. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Faculty Sample

204. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

205. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

206. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

207. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

208. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

Research

50. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

100. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

152. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Deans' Sample

153. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Chairs' Sample

154. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Faculty Sample

155. Tenure Weight for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

156. Tenure Weight for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

157. Tenure Weight for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

209. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

210. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Professors' Salary and Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

211. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

212. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

213. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

214. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

215. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Professors' Salary and Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

216. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

217. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

218. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

Service

51. Tenure Weight for Institutional Service by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

52. Tenure Weight for Community Service by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

158. Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--National Reputation, Deans' Sample

159. Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--National Reputation, Chairs' Sample

160. Tenure Weight for Professional Organizational Service by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--National Presentation, Faculty Sample

161. Tenure Weight for Service to the Institution by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Internal Reputation, Deans' Sample

162. Tenure Weight for Service to the Institution by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Internal Reputation, Chairs' Sample

163. Tenure Weight for Service to the Institution by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Internal Reputation, Faculty Sample

D. MERIT PAY

General

27. Reports of Merit Salary Awards, by Position

56. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Deans' Sample

57. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Chairs' Sample

58. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Faculty Sample

164. Relationship Between Selected Merit Salary Variables and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

Teaching

9. Merit Increases for Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample

55. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

101. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

165. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

166. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

167. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

168. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Deans' Sample

169. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Chairs' Sample

170. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Faculty Sample

171. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Student Attrition, Chairs' Sample

Research

102. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

172. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

173. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

174. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

E. ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENT QUALITY

General

30. Perceptions of the Importance of Selected Factors in the Deans' Program Assessments

36. Relationships Among Deans' Department Assessment Factors, Deans' Sample

37. Relationships Among Deans' Department Assessment Factors, Chairs' Sample

39. Relationships Among Deans' Department Assessment Factors

43. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Deans' Sample

44. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Chairs' Sample

45. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Faculty Sample

63. Relationship Among Deans' Performance Variables, Deans' Sample

64. Relationships Among Deans' Performance Variables, Chairs' Sample

65. Relationships Among Deans' Performance Variables, Faculty Sample

72. Relationships Among Department Chairs' Performance Variables

87. Relationships Between Deans' Performance and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

105. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Student Attrition by Deans' Race, Deans' Sample

141. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards and Adequacy of Resources, Faculty Sample

142. Relationships Between Teaching Variables and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

Teaching

10. Faculty Views of the Deans' Value Placed on Teaching in the Assessment of Department Quality, by Discipline

11. Quality of Departmental Teaching, as Rated by Departmental Faculty, by Discipline

31. Deans' Ratings of the Quality of Teaching and Research in Nine Departments

40. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

41. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Faculty Sample

42. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Faculty Sample

89. Department Teaching Quality by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

90. Department Teaching Quality by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Faculty Sample

94. Department Teaching Quality by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

221. Regression of Deans' Departmental Assessment--Teaching Quality on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

231. Regression of Quality of Department Teaching on Selected Communications, Impact, Influence, and Management Style Variables, Faculty Sample

Research

12. Quality of Departmental Research, as Rated by Departmental Faculty, by Discipline

38. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

92. Department Research Quality by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

93. Department Research Quality by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

95. Department Research Quality by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

219. Regression of Deans' Departmental Assessment--Extramural Grants on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

220. Regression of Deans' Departmental Assessment--Publication Rate on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

232. Regression of Quality of Department Research on Selected Communications, Impact, Influence, and Management Style Variables, Faculty Sample

F. IMPACT ON THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION

Faculty Impact on Quality

13. Influence of Faculty Committees on the Direction of Policy, by Discipline

14. Faculty Members' Ratings of Their Own Impact on the Quality of Departmental Education, by Discipline

68. Influence of Faculty Committees by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

103. Committee Influence by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

222. Regression of Committee Influence on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

223. Regression of Committee Influence on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

Chairs' Impact on Quality

73. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Chairs' Management Style, Faculty Sample

74. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Chairs' Communication with Faculty, Faculty Sample

75. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Impact on Educational Quality, Chairs' Sample

76. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Impact on Educational Quality, Faculty Sample

Deans' Impact on Quality

66. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Management Style, Faculty Sample

67. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Communication with Faculty, Faculty Sample

69. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

104. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

224. Regression of Deans' Impact on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

225. Regression of Deans' Impact on Selected Assessment Variables, Chairs' Sample

G. MANAGEMENT STYLE

Deans

15. Faculty Members' Rating of the Dean's Management Style, By Discipline

33. Perceptions of the Deans' Management Style, by Position

70. Deans' Management Style by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

226. Regression of Deans' Management Style on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

227. Regression of Deans' Management Style on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

Chairs

16. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Chairs' Management Style, by Discipline

77. Chairs' Management Style by Dean's Management Style, Chairs' Sample

78. Chairs' Management Style by Deans' Management Style, Faculty Sample

H. COMMUNICATION STYLE

Deans

17. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Deans' Communications, by Discipline

32. Perceptions of the Deans' Communication with Chairs, by Position

34. Perceptions of the Deans' Communication with Faculty, by Position

71. Deans' Communication with Faculty by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

228. Regression of Deans' Communication with Chairs on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

229. Regression of Deans' Communication with Faculty on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

230. Regression of Deans' Communication with Faculty on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Chairs

18. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Chairs' Communications, by Discipline

35. Perceptions of the Chairs' Communication with Faculty, by Position

79. Chairs' Communication with Faculty by Deans' Communication with Faculty, Chairs' Sample

80. Chairs' Communication with Faculty by Deans' Communication with Faculty, Faculty Sample

I. SUPPORT FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

21. Number of Out-of-State Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty in 1984-85, by Discipline

22. Proportion of Total Costs for Out-of-State Meeting Attendance Reimbursed by the Institution, by Discipline

23. Professional Development Funds Per Faculty Member, by Discipline

24. Ratings of the Adequacy of Salaries of Full Professors, by Position

25. Estimates of the Availability of Funds for Various Categories of Faculty Support, by Position

189. Relationships Between Professional Development Variables, Selected Formal Rewards and Selected Deans' Departmental Assessment Factors

190. Number of Out-of-State Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Papers Given at Professional Meetings, Faculty Sample

191. Proportion of Meeting Attendance Costs Reimbursed by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Papers Given at Professional Meetings, Faculty Sample

192. Total Professional Development Support by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

193. Total Professional Development Support by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

194. Total Professional Development Support by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

195. Number of Out-of-State Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty, by Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations, Faculty Sample

196. Proportion of Meeting Attendance Costs Reimbursed by Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations, Faculty Sample

J. RESOURCE ALLOCATION POLICY

28. Perceptions of the Deans' Resource Allocation Policy for Outstanding Programs, by Position

29. Perceptions of the Deans' Resource Allocation Policy for Inferior Programs, by Position

97. Deans' Priorities--Upgrading Inferior Departments by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

98. Deans' Priorities--Maintaining Outstanding Departments by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

K. CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

19. Gender of Faculty Respondents, by Discipline

20. Race of Faculty Respondents, by Discipline

81. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Deans' Characteristics, Teaching Variables and Resource Adequacy

82. Relationships Between Department Characteristics and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

83. Relationships Between Department Characteristics and Deans' Priorities, Formal Rewards, Deans' Performance and Chairs' Performance

84. Relationships Between Department Characteristics and Chairs' Characteristics, Teaching Variables and Resource Adequacy

85. Relationships Between Selected Deans' Characteristics and Deans' Performance Variables

86. Relationships Between Selected Chairs' Characteristics and Chairs' Performance Variables

96. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Deans' Priorities, Formal Rewards and Deans' Performance

106. Relationship Between Institutional Characteristics and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

NUMERICAL LIST OF TABLES

Table Title

1. Teaching Load by Discipline, Faculty Sample
2. Time Spent Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample
3. Funds for Travel to Conferences by Discipline, Faculty Sample
4. Funds for Research by Untenured Professors by Discipline, Faculty Sample
5. Funds for the Purchase of Library Journals by Discipline, Faculty Sample
6. Funds for Offering Courses Often Enough by Discipline, Faculty Sample
7. Funds for Sabbaticals to Improve Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample
8. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample
9. Merit Increases for Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample
10. Faculty Views of the Deans' Value Placed on Teaching in the Assessment of Department Quality, by Discipline
11. Quality of Departmental Teaching as Rated by Departmental Faculty, by Discipline
12. Quality of Departmental Research as Rated by Departmental Faculty, by Discipline
13. Influence of Faculty Committees on the Direction of Policy, by Discipline
14. Faculty Members' Ratings of Their Own Impact on the Quality of Departmental Education, by Discipline
15. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Deans' Management Style, by Discipline
16. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Chairs' Management Style, by Discipline
17. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Deans' Communications, by Discipline
18. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Chairs' Communications, by Discipline
19. Gender of Faculty Respondents, by Discipline
20. Race of Faculty Respondents, by Discipline

21. Number of Out-of-State Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty in 1984-85, by Discipline

22. Proportion of Total Costs for Out-of-State Meeting Attendance Reimbursed by the Institution, by Discipline

23. Professional Development Funds per Faculty Member, by Discipline

24. Ratings of the Adequacy of Salaries of Full Professors, by Position

25. Estimates of the Availability of Funds for Various Categories of Faculty Support, by Position

26. Reports of Tenure Weights, by Position

27. Reports of Merit Salary Awards, by Position

28. Perceptions of the Deans' Resource Allocation Policy for Outstanding Programs, by Position

29. Perceptions of the Deans' Resource Allocation Policy for Inferior Programs, by Position

30. Perceptions of the Importance of Selected Factors in the Deans' Program Assessments

31. Deans' Ratings of the Quality of Teaching and Research in Nine Departments

32. Perceptions of the Deans' Communication with Chairs, by Position

33. Perceptions of the Deans' Management Style, by Position

34. Perceptions of the Deans' Communication with Faculty, by Position

35. Perceptions of the Chairs' Communication with Faculty, by Position

36. Relationships Among Deans' Department Assessment Factors, Deans' Sample

37. Relationships Among Deans' Department Assessment Factors, Chairs' Sample

38. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

39. Relationships Among Deans' Department Assessment Factors

40. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

41. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Faculty Sample

42. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Faculty Sample

43. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Deans' Sample

44. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Chairs' Sample

45. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Faculty Sample

46. Relationships Among Tenure Weights and Merit Salary Awards, Deans' Sample

47. Relationships Among Tenure Weights and Merit Salary Awards, Chairs' Sample

48. Relationships Among Tenure Weights and Merit Salary Awards, Faculty Sample

49. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

50. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

51. Tenure Weight for Institutional Service by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

52. Tenure Weight for Community Service by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

53. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Faculty Sample

54. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

55. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

56. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Deans' Sample

57. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Chairs' Sample

58. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Faculty Sample

59. Relationships Among Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

60. Relationships Among Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

61. Factor Analysis of Adequacy of Resources, Chairs' Sample

62. Factor Analysis of Adequacy of Resources, Faculty Sample

63. Relationships Among Deans' Performance Variables, Deans' Sample

64. Relationships Among Deans' Performance Variables, Chairs' Sample

65. Relationships Among Deans' Performance Variables, Faculty Sample

66. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Management Style, Faculty Sample

67. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Communications with Faculty, Faculty Sample

68. Influence of Faculty Committees by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

69. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

70. Deans' Management Style by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

71. Deans' Communication with Faculty by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

72. Relationships Among Department Chairs' Performance Variables

73. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Chairs' Management Style, Faculty Sample

74. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Chairs' Communication with Faculty, Faculty Sample

75. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Impact on Educational Quality, Chairs' Sample

76. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Impact on Educational Quality, Faculty Sample

77. Chairs' Management Style by Deans' Management Style, Chairs' Sample

78. Chairs' Management Style by Deans' Management Style, Faculty Sample

79. Chairs' Communication with Faculty by Dean's Communication with Faculty, Chairs' Sample

80. Chairs' Communication with Faculty by Deans' Communication with Faculty, Faculty Sample

81. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Deans' Characteristics, Teaching Variables and Resource Adequacy

82. Relationships Between Department Characteristics and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

83. Relationships Between Department Characteristics and Deans' Priorities, Formal Rewards, Deans' Performance and Chairs' Performance

84. Relationships Between Department Characteristics and Chairs' Characteristics, Teaching Variables and Resource Adequacy

85. Relationships Between Selected Deans' Characteristics and Deans' Performance Variables

86. Relationships Between Selected Chairs' Characteristics and Chairs' Performance Variables

87. Relationships Between Deans' Performance and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

88. Relationships Between Selected Resource Adequacy Variables and Deans' Ratings of Departmental Teaching Quality

89. Department Teaching Quality by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

90. Department Teaching Quality by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Faculty Sample

91. Relationships Between Selected Resource Adequacy Variables and Deans' Ratings of Departmental Research Quality

92. Department Research Quality by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

93. Department Research Quality by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

94. Department Teaching Quality by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

95. Department Research Quality by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

96. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Deans' Priorities, Formal Rewards and Deans' Performance

97. Deans' Priorities--Upgrading Inferior Departments by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

98. Deans' Priorities--Maintaining Outstanding Departments by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

99. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

100. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

101. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

102. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

103. Committee Influence by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

104. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

105. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Student Attrition by Deans' Race, Deans' Sample

106. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

107. Relationships Between Teaching Variables and Formal Rewards

108. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Deans' Sample

109. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

110. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

111. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Deans' Sample

112. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Chairs' Sample

113. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Faculty Sample

114. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

115. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Deans' Sample

116. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

117. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Faculty Sample

118. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

119. Resource Adequacy by Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Faculty Sample

120. Adequacy of Resources for Grants Travel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Grants, Faculty Sample

121. Adequacy of Resources for Grant Development Personnel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Grants, Faculty Sample

122. Adequacy of Resources for Travel to Develop Grants by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Deans' Sample

123. Adequacy of Resources for Travel to Develop Grants by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Chairs' Sample

124. Adequacy of Resources for Grant Development Personnel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Deans' Sample

125. Adequacy of Resources for Grant Development Personnel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Chairs' Sample

126. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

127. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

128. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

129. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

130. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

131. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

132. Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

133. Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

134. Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

135. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

136. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

137. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

138. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

139. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

140. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

141. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards and Adequacy of Resources, Faculty Sample

142. Relationships Between Teaching Variables and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

143. Faculty Teaching Load by Deans' Department Assessment Standard--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

144. Faculty Teaching Load by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

145. Relationships Between Selected Tenure Weights and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

146. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

147. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

148. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

149. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Deans' Sample

150. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Chairs' Sample

151. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Faculty Sample

152. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Deans' Sample

153. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Chairs' Sample

154. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Faculty Sample

155. Tenure Weight for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

156. Tenure Weight for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

157. Tenure Weight for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

158. Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--National Reputation, Deans' Sample

159. Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--National Reputation, Chairs' Sample

160. Tenure Weight for Professional Organizational Service by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--National Presentation, Faculty Sample

161. Tenure Weight for Service to the Institution by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Internal Reputation, Deans' Sample

162. Tenure Weight for Service to the Institution by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Internal Reputation, Chairs' Sample

163. Tenure Weight for Service to the Institution by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Internal Reputation, Faculty Sample

164. Relationships Between Selected Merit Salary Variables and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

165. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

166. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

167. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

168. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Deans' Sample

169. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Chairs' Sample

170. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Faculty Sample

171. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Student Attrition, Chairs' Sample

172. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

173. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

174. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

175. Relationships Between Formal Rewards for Teaching and Resource Adequacy

176. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Deans' Sample

177. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Chairs' Sampie

178. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

179. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Deans' Sample

180. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

181. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

182. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Deans' Sample

183. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Chairs' Sample

184. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

185. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Deans' Sample

186. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Chairs' Sample

187. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

188. Adequacy of Full Professors' Salaries by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Deans' Sample

189. Relationships Between Professional Development Variables, Selected Formal Rewards and Selected Deans' Department Assessment Factors

190. Number of Out-of-State Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Papers Given at Professional Meetings, Faculty Sample

191. Proportion of Meeting Attendance Costs Reimbursed by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Papers Given at Professional Meetings, Faculty Sample

192. Total Professional Development Support by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

193. Total Professional Development Support by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

194. Total Professional Development Support by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

195. Number of Out-of-State Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty, by Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations, Faculty Sample

196. Proportion of Meeting Attendance Costs Reimbursed by Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations, Faculty Sample

197. Regression of Professors' Salary on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

198. Regression of Teaching Load on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

199. Regression of Percentage of Time Teaching on Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

200. Regression of Percentage of Time Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

201. Regression of Percentage of Time Spent Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

202. Regression of Percentage of Time Spent Teaching on Selected Deans' Assessment Variables, Chairs' Sample

203. Regression of Percentage of Time Spent Teaching on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

204. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

205. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

206. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

207. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

208. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

209. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

210. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Professors' Salary and Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

211. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

212. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

213. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

214. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

215. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Professors' Salary and Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

216. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

217. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

218. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

219. Regression of Deans' Department Assessment--Extramural Grants on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

220. Regression of Deans' Departmental Assessment--Publication Rate on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

221. Regression of Deans' Departmental Assessment--Teaching Quality on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

222. Regression of Committee Influence on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

223. Regression of Committee Influence on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

224. Regression of Deans' Impact on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

225. Regression of Deans' Impact on Selected Assessment Variables, Chairs' Sample

226. Regression of Deans' Management Style on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

227. Regression of Deans' Management Style on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

228. Regression of Deans' Communication with Chairs on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

229. Regression of Deans' Communication with Faculty on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

230. Regression of Deans' Communication with Faculty on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

231. Regression of Quality of Department Teaching on Selected Communications, Impact, Influence, and Management Style Variables, Faculty Sample

232. Regression of Quality of Department Research on Selected Communications, Impact, Influence, and Management Style Variables, Faculty Sample

REFERENCES

Lee H. Bowker, "The College Dean: A Case of the Miscommunication About the Importance of Teaching." *Liberal Education*, 67 (1981:319-326).

Lee H. Bowker, David M. Lynch and J. Richard McFerron. *The Administration of Liberal Arts in American Colleges and Universities.* Institute for Advanced Research, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1985. (Available from the ERIC Clearing House on Higher Education, Document # ED 256221)

David M. Lynch and Lee H. Bowker. *Graduate Deans and Graduate Education: A National Study*. Institute for Advanced Research, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1984. (Available from the ERIC Clearing House on Higher Education, Document # ED 247872)

David M. Lynch and Lee H. Bowker. *The Status of Adult Education and Continuing Education within American Institutions of Higher Learning*. Institute for Advanced Research, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1985. (Available from the ERIC Clearing House on Higher Education, Document # ED 311816)

J. Richard McFerron. "Using SPSSX to Manage a Multi-phase National Survey." Paper presented at the First Annual Academic Conference for SPSSX Users, Montreal, Canada, June 1990.

monograph.jaw
5/91

Table 1. Teaching Load by Discipline, Faculty Sample

	Discipline									
Teaching Load	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
None	0%	4%	3%	1%	2%	1%	8%	4%	0%	2%
1-7 Semester Credits	21%	31%	8%	10%	14%	2%	25%	20%	14%	17%
8-10 Semester Credits	31%	27%	24%	38%	24%	11%	25%	26%	32%	27%
11-13 Semester Credits	38%	33%	54%	41%	48%	56%	33%	45%	44%	44%
14 or More Semester Credits	9%	6%	12%	10%	12%	30%	8%	5%	11%	11%
Total	99%*	101%*	101%*	100%	100%	100%	99%*	100%	101%*	101%*
N	183	172	155	109	175	98	60	116	104	1172

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

tab2.tabl.jaw
4/1/91

Table 2. Time Spent Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample

	Discipline									
Time Spent Teaching	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Less than 25%	7%	11%	4%	5%	4%	2%	0%	4%	0%	5%
25% - 49%	22%	27%	8%	18%	14%	9%	27%	30%	29%	20%
50% - 74%	29%	22%	35%	43%	33%	28%	48%	37%	44%	33%
75% or more	43%	39%	54%	34%	50%	61%	25%	29%	28%	42%
Total	101%*	101%*	101%*	100%	101%*	100%	100%	100%	101%*	100%
N	182	168	153	108	173	97	59	114	101	1155

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

tab2.tab2.jaw
4/1/91

Table 3. Funds for Travel to Conferences by Discipline, Faculty Sample

Level of Funding for Travel to Conferences	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Poor	30%	40%	29%	27%	19%	38%	35%	33%	47%	32%
Fair	39%	26%	31%	39%	42%	39%	40%	32%	33%	35%
Good	23%	28%	26%	26%	30%	20%	15%	23%	14%	24%
Excellent	8%	6%	14%	8%	9%	3%	10%	12%	7%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%*	100%
N	179	169	153	107	171	98	60	116	103	1156

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

tab2.tab3.jaw
4/1/91

Table 4. Funds for Research by Untenured Professors by Discipline, Faculty Sample

Level of Funding for Research by Untenured Faculty	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Poor	37%	31%	42%	39%	33%	64%	29%	32%	44%	38%
Fair	32%	32%	35%	32%	46%	26%	44%	40%	35%	36%
Good	26%	30%	19%	25%	19%	9%	22%	19%	16%	21%
Excellent	6%	8%	4%	4%	2%	1%	5%	9%	6%	5%
Total	101%*	101%*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%*	100%
N	178	170	152	100	163	89	59	115	101	1127

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 5. Funds for the Purchase of Library Journals by Discipline, Faculty Sample

Level of Funding for Library Journals	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Poor	27%	22%	23%	28%	16%	15%	27%	24%	32%	23%
Fair	40%	30%	34%	43%	36%	41%	33%	33%	32%	36%
Good	26%	39%	36%	19%	40%	34%	37%	32%	28%	33%
Excellent	7%	8%	7%	10%	8%	10%	3%	10%	7%	8%
Total	100%	99%*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%*	99%*	100%
N	181	171	151	107	168	96	60	114	102	1150

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 6. Funds for Offering Courses Often Enough by Discipline, Faculty Sample

Level of Funding for Offering Courses	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Poor	7%	4%	13%	11%	5%	5%	9%	6%	12%	8%
Fair	22%	20%	35%	26%	20%	25%	30%	22%	34%	25%
Good	56%	63%	44%	54%	62%	59%	51%	53%	46%	55%
Excellent	15%	13%	8%	10%	14%	11%	10%	20%	8%	12%
Total	100%	100%	100%	101%*	101%*	100%	100%	101%*	100%	100%
N	178	166	148	102	168	97	57	116	100	1132

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 7. Funds for Sabbaticals to Improve Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample

Level of Funding for Sabbaticals	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Poor	32%	36%	35%	33%	36%	21%	21%	32%	33%	32
Fair	30%	26%	35%	26%	27%	40%	47%	32%	33%	32%
Good	30%	28%	26%	30%	31%	30%	28%	24%	30%	29%
Excellent	8%	10%	5%	11%	6%	8%	4%	12%	3%	7%
Total	100%	100%	101%*	100%	100%	99%*	100%	100%	99%*	100%
N	173	166	150	103	166	94	57	115	102	1126

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 8. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample

Tenure Weight (1 = Highest Weight)	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
1	49%	40%	68%	45%	62%	77%	51%	40%	47%	53%
2	11%	17%	14%	24%	11%	5%	17%	21%	18%	15%
3	31%	38%	16%	23%	21%	13%	30%	27%	29%	26%
4, 5, 6	8%	4%	3%	8%	6%	4%	2%	12%	7%	6%
Total	99%*	99%*	101%*	100%	100%	99%*	100%	100%	101%*	100%
N	179	166	148	106	169	97	59	116	103	1143

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 9. Merit Increases for Teaching by Discipline, Faculty Sample

Discipline	Proportion Using Merit Increases to Reward Excellence in Teaching	N
Biology	43%	180
Chemistry	46%	164
English	50%	146
History	40%	106
Mathematics	54%	169
Music	53%	90
Political Science	64%	58
Psychology	56%	111
Sociology	47%	100
Total	49%	1124

Table 10. Faculty Views of the Deans' Value Placed on Teaching in the Assessment of Department Quality, by Discipline

	Discipline									
Deans' Value Placed on Teaching	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Not Important	10%	8%	5%	12%	4%	2%	9%	9%	5%	7%
Some Importance	26%	28%	21%	19%	20%	9%	16%	22%	26%	22%
Important	35%	34%	32%	34%	38%	42%	40%	35%	41%	36%
Very Important	29%	30%	43%	34%	38%	47%	36%	34%	29%	35%
Total	100%	100%	101%*	99%*	100%	100%	101%*	100%	101%*	100%
N	178	168	150	105	168	93	58	113	101	1134

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 11. Quality of Departmental Teaching as Rated by Departmental Faculty, by Discipline

	Discipline									
Quality of Departmental Teaching	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Inferior	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%
Fair	9%	12%	14%	10%	13%	9%	15%	8%	16%	12%
Good	65%	64%	62%	56%	62%	65%	55%	60%	69%	63%
Outstanding	25%	22%	24%	34%	24%	26%	30%	30%	16%	25%
Total	99%*	99%*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%*	101%*
N	182	169	152	109	172	97	60	116	102	1159

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 12. Quality of Departmental Research as Rated by Departmental Faculty, by Discipline

Quality of Departmental Research	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Inferior	9%	11%	9%	6%	22%	9%	12%	13%	9%	11%
Fair	47%	42%	45%	21%	42%	38%	28%	27%	42%	39%
Good	35%	34%	40%	53%	32%	42%	50%	41%	40%	39%
Outstanding	9%	13%	6%	20%	4%	12%	10%	19%	9%	11%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%*	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	182	168	152	109	170	96	60	116	100	1153

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 13. Influence of Faculty Committees on the Direction of Policy, by Discipline

Influence of Faculty Committees	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Not influential	16%	19%	18%	20%	16%	13%	17%	14%	21%	17%
Some influence	44%	41%	37%	38%	42%	44%	41%	46%	52%	43%
Influential	32%	27%	30%	32%	28%	34%	30%	34%	21%	30%
Very influential	8%	13%	14%	9%	14%	9%	12%	6%	6%	11%
Total	100%	100%	99%*	99%*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%*
N	181	170	152	108	171	98	59	115	101	1155

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 14. Faculty Members' Ratings of Their Own Impact on the Quality of Departmental Education, by Discipline

Impact of Faculty on Departmental Education	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
None	3%	1%	5%	6%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%
Limited degree	32%	32%	38%	32%	44%	14%	42%	33%	39%	34%
Fairly much	50%	44%	36%	46%	40%	56%	40%	50%	43%	45%
Very much	16%	22%	21%	16%	13%	28%	15%	14%	16%	18%
Total	101%*	99%*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%*	101%*	100%
N	177	169	154	104	174	95	60	115	103	1151

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 15. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Deans' Management Style, by Discipline

Ratings of Deans' Management	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Low participation	16%	16%	18%	20%	11%	19%	21%	18%	15%	17%
Low average	21%	20%	13%	16%	17%	20%	21%	25%	12%	18%
Average	30%	20%	18%	26%	41%	29%	29%	32%	33%	28%
High average	26%	33%	38%	22%	28%	23%	17%	22%	34%	28%
High participation	8%	11%	14%	16%	4%	8%	12%	4%	7%	9%
Total	101%*	100%	101%*	100%	101%*	99%*	100%	101%*	101%*	100%
N	173	162	149	103	170	94	58	114	101	1124

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 16. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Chairs' Management Style, by Discipline

Ratings of Chairs' Management	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Low participation	8%	6%	7%	9%	9%	15%	7%	9%	8%	8%
Low average	11%	19%	12%	12%	12%	13%	14%	10%	16%	13%
Average	18%	18%	17%	27%	18%	20%	17%	13%	22%	19%
High average	33%	28%	35%	26%	36%	24%	41%	40%	26%	32%
High participation	30%	29%	29%	27%	26%	28%	22%	29%	28%	28%
Total	100%	100%	100%	101%*	101%*	100%	101%*	101%*	100%	100%
N	175	162	150	105	171	94	59	115	100	1131

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 17. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Deans' Communications, by Discipline

	Discipline									
Ratings of Deans' Communications	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Very little	22%	21%	20%	27%	15%	27%	25%	22%	22%	22%
Low average	26%	18%	20%	21%	18%	22%	17%	19%	19%	20%
Average	20%	23%	21%	18%	39%	19%	25%	28%	30%	25%
High average	19%	24%	26%	25%	21%	22%	25%	24%	23%	23%
Very much	12%	15%	13%	9%	8%	10%	7%	7%	5%	10%
Total	99%*	101%*	100%	100%	101%*	100%	99%*	100%	99%*	100%
N	176	164	151	103	171	94	59	114	103	1135

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 18. Faculty Members' Ratings of the Chairs' Communications, by Discipline

	Discipline									
Ratings of Chairs' Communicatons	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Very little	9%	9%	6%	8%	11%	19%	10%	4%	10%	9%
Low average	10%	10%	10%	13%	9%	7%	12%	9%	12%	10%
Average	12%	21%	14%	11%	17%	18%	15%	17%	19%	16%
High average	33%	29%	28%	31%	28%	19%	33%	30%	29%	29%
Very much	36%	31%	41%	36%	34%	36%	30%	40%	31%	35%
Total	100%	100%	99%*	99%*	99%*	99%*	100%	100%	101%*	99%*
N	176	166	152	106	174	94	60	115	101	1144

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 19. Gender of Faculty Respondents, by Discipline

	Gender		
Discipline	Percent Female	Percent Male	N
Biology	18	82	177
Chemistry	6	94	168
English	34	66	155
History	13	87	106
Mathematics	16	84	174
Music	16	84	94
Political Science	13	87	60
Psychology	25	75	115
Sociology	31	69	101
Total	19	81	1150

Table 20. Race of Faculty Respondents, by Discipline

	Race		
Discipline	Percent Minority	Percent White	N
Biology	3	97	177
Chemistry	7	93	167
English	6	94	153
History	8	92	105
Mathematics	8	92	170
Music	7	93	95
Political Science	7	93	59
Psychology	4	96	115
Sociology	10	90	103
Total	6	94	1144

Table 21. Number of Out-of-State Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty in 1984-85, by Discipline

Professional Meetings Attended	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
0	20%	22%	28%	21%	35%	34%	18%	22%	17%	25%
1	34%	30%	24%	29%	34%	34%	33%	31%	30%	31%
2	24%	22%	29%	25%	17%	15%	15%	28%	27%	23%
3	15%	15%	10%	16%	6%	8%	20%	13%	17%	13%
4 or more	7%	11%	8%	9%	9%	8%	13%	7%	9%	9%
Total	100%	100%	99%*	100%	101%*	99%*	99%*	101%*	100%	101%*
N	183	172	155	109	175	98	60	116	104	1172

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 22. Proportion of Total Costs for Out-of-State Meeting Attendance Reimbursed by the Institution, by Discipline

Proportion of Meeting Costs Paid by Institutions	Discipline									
	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Zero	21%	34%	13%	16%	16%	35%	15%	25%	17%	22%
1% - 25%	14%	9%	10%	12%	6%	10%	25%	12%	21%	12%
26% - 50%	13%	10%	19%	25%	11%	14%	12%	20%	14%	15%
51% - 75%	11%	11%	17%	13%	11%	14%	14%	15%	20%	13%
76% - 90%	15%	9%	14%	19%	16%	19%	19%	12%	10%	14%
91% or more	27%	26%	27%	15%	41%	8%	15%	16%	18%	23%
Total	101%*	99%*	100%	100%	101%*	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%*
N	160	149	120	93	128	78	52	96	92	968

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 23. Professional Development Funds per Faculty Member, by Discipline

Professional Development Funds	Biology	Chemistry	English	History	Math	Music	PolSci	Psych.	Sociology	Total
Zero	9%	17%	13%	14%	16%	28%	9%	13%	10%	14%
$1 - $250	17%	12%	21%	19%	17%	26%	26%	22%	19%	19%
$251 - $500	20%	13%	23%	28%	22%	17%	14%	18%	29%	20%
$501 - $1,000	18%	16%	16%	15%	20%	19%	16%	10%	24%	17%
$1,001 - $2,000	14%	18%	10%	12%	7%	3%	18%	11%	11%	12%
More than $2,000	22%	24%	16%	11%	18%	6%	16%	26%	6%	18%
Total	100%	100%	99%*	101%*	100%	99%*	99%*	100%	99%*	100%
N	177	169	146	105	162	93	55	110	99	1116

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 24. Ratings of the Adequacy of Salaries of Full Professors, by Position

	Positions		
Adequacy of Salaries of Full Professors	Percent Deans	Percent Chairs	Percent Faculty
Very poor	1	7	7
Poor	24	32	32
Average	39	44	40
Good	23	15	16
Very good	12	3	5
Total	99*	101*	100
N	140	392	1140

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 25. Estimates of the Availability of Funds for Various Categories of Faculty Support, by Position

	Positions		
Availability of Funds*	Percent Deans	Percent Chairs	Percent Faculty
Travel to conferences	49	39	33
Travel to develop grants	21	19	15
Research by senior professors	31	18	21
Research by untenured professors	36	26	26
Purchase of computer equipment	63	43	44
Purchase of research equipment	28	18	20
Purchase of library books	54	55	48
Purchase of library journals	54	40	41
Personnel for grant development	27	22	24
Offering courses frequently enough	86	78	67
Student research assistants	21	21	19
Student teaching assistants	28	39	32
Sabbaticals to improve teaching	58	46	36
Sabbaticals to do publishable research	64	56	46
N	142	392	1172

*Percentages refer to the proportion of respondents in each position who estimate the availability of funds for a given support category to be good or excellent.

Table 26. Reports of Tenure Weights, by Position

	Positions**		
Tenure Weights*	Percent Deans	Percent Chairs	Percent Faculty
Teaching	77	76	53
Research	10	14	16
Publication	18	19	35
Committees	0	1	2
Professional Organizations	0	0	0
Community Service	0	0	0
N	142	392	1172

*Percentages refer to the proportion of respondents in each position who rated each factor as the most important factor in tenure decisions (highest tenure weight).

**Percentages sum more than 100 because of ties for the highest ranking tenure weight.

Table 27. Reports of Merit Salary Awards, by Position

	Positions		
Merit Salary Awards	Percent Deans	Percent Chairs	Percent Faculty
For teaching	75	67	49
For research	75	64	65
For community service	38	34	20
N	140	392	1172

Table 28. Perceptions of the Deans' Resource Allocation Policy for Outstanding Programs, by Position

Priority Placed on Maintaining Outstanding Programs	Positions Percent Deans	Percent Chairs	Percent Faculty
First Priority	67	57	59
Second Priority	19	22	20
Lower Priority	13	21	21
Total	99*	100	100
N	134	322	931

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 29. Perceptions of the Deans' Resource Allocation Policy for Inferior Programs, by Position

		Positions	
Priority Placed on Improving Inferior Programs	Percent Deans	Percent Chairs	Percent Faculty
First Priority	13	16	14
Second Priority	13	10	11
Third Priority	8	14	13
Lower Priority	67	60	62
Total	101*	100	100
N	118	297	870

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 30. Perceptions of the Importance of Selected Factors in the Deans' Program Assessments

Factors in the Deans' Program Assessments	Positions Percent Deans	 Percent Chairs	 Percent Faculty
Grants obtained	45	37	56
Publications	58	47	64
Papers delivered	60	45	53
Conferences organized	44	33	42
Enrollment	74	81	69
Teaching quality	96	92	71
Internal reputation	75	79	70
External reputation	60	42	52
Student quality	79	57	41
Attrition	58	48	43
Number, level of courses	55	49	33
Time for degree	20	22	18
Fellowship awards to students	38	23	16
Placement of graduates	71	43	29
Research quality	84	67	68
N	142	392	1172

*Percentages represent the proportion of the respondents in each position who rated each factor as important or very important in the deans' program assessments.

Table 31. Deans' Ratings of the Quality of Teaching and Research in Nine Departments

	Proportion Rated as Providing Outstanding:	
Department	Teaching	Research
Biology	38%	33%
Chemistry	25%	21%
English	27%	12%
History	36%	24%
Mathematics	24%	12%
Music	26%	11%
Political Science	24%	13%
Psychology	30%	22%
Sociology	18%	8%

N = 142

Table 32. Perceptions of the Deans' Communication with Chairs, by Position

	Positions	
Deans' Communication	Deans	Chairs
Very little	0%	2%
Low average	1%	12%
Average	4%	19%
High average	28%	34%
Very much	67%	32%
Total	100%	99%*
N	142	386

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 33. Perceptions of the Deans' Management Style, by Position

	Positions		
Deans' Management Style	Percent Deans	Percent Chairs	Percent Faculty
Low participation	1	4	16
Low average	1	15	18
Average	16	25	28
High average	60	38	28
High participation	21	18	9
Total	99*	100	99*
N	142	384	1124

*Where percentages do not sum 100, it is due to statistical rounding procedures.

Table 34. Perceptions of the Deans' Communication with Faculty, by Position

	Positions		
Deans' Communication	Percent Deans	Percent Chairs	Percent Faculty
Very little	0	7	22
Low average	4	17	20
Average	16	30	25
High average	47	30	23
Very much	33	16	10
Total	100	100	100
N	142	384	1135

Table 35. Perceptions of the Chairs' Communication with Faculty, by Position

	Positions	
Chairs' Communication	Chairs	Faculty
Very little	0%	9%
Low average	2%	10%
Average	8%	16%
High average	38%	29%
Very much	52%	35%
Total	100%	99%*
N	389	1144

Table 36. Relationships Among Deans' Department Assessment Factors, Deans' Sample[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Grants obtained	X														
2. Publications	.54***	X													
3. Papers delivered	.41***	.59***	X												
4. Conferences organized	.23**	.19**	.46***	X											
5. Enrollment	.10	.06	.00	.07	X										
6. Teaching quality	-.17*	-.18*	-.15*	.14	.05	X									
7. Internal reputation	.03	-.07	-.09	.06	.21**	.23**	X								
8. External reputation	.44***	.34***	.28***	.25**	.11	-.11	.21**	X							
9. Student quality	.07	.01	.03	.14*	.00	.27***	.19**	.26***	X						
10. Attrition	.03	-.10	-.07	.16*	.25***	.09	.14*	.05	.27***	X					
11. Course quality	.05	.01	.02	.18*	.24***	.20**	.17*	.12	.33***	.33***	X				
12. Time for degree	.12	-.11	-.15*	.05	.11	.05	.27***	.09	.25***	.38***	.25***	X			
13. Fellowship awards to students	.22**	.10	.08	.12	-.09	.06	.13*	.27***	.29***	.13	.13*	.31***	X		
14. Placement of graduates	.21**	.11	.16*	.16*	.08	.07	.22**	.21**	.28***	.24**	.20**	.28***	.30***	X	
15. Research quality	.42***	.65***	.46***	.22**	-.05	-.17*	-.04	.29***	.10	-.08	-.03	-.04	.17*	.05	X

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.

Table 37. Relationships Among Deans' Department Assessment Factors, Chairs' Sample[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Grants obtained	X														
2. Publications	.55***	X													
3. Papers delivered	.44***	.69***	X												
4. Conferences organized	.29***	.39***	.61***	X											
5. Enrollment	-.01	-.08*	.06	.00	X										
6. Teaching quality	-.16***	-.11**	.01	.08	.07	X									
7. Internal reputation	.01	.02	.05	.09*	.14**	.26***	X								
8. External reputation	.37***	.41***	.30***	.28***	-.06	-.03	.22***	X							
9. Student quality	-.02	-.04	-.03	.07	.04	.36***	.29***	.25***	X						
10. Attrition	-.09*	-.21***	-.12	-.01	.34***	.07	.17***	.01	.28***	X					
11. Course quality	-.13**	-.15***	-.07	.02	.11**	.33***	.21***	.04	.40***	.30***	X				
12. Time for degree	-.01	-.06	-.01	.08*	.08*	.07	.14**	.10*	.25***	.28***	.37***	X			
13. Fellowship awards to students	.23***	.15***	.12**	.20***	.01	.02	.13**	.31***	.27***	.15***	.13**	.32***	X		
14. Placement of graduates	.06	-.01	.07	.17***	.07	.18***	.14**	.14**	.34***	.16***	.26***	.21***	.43***	X	
15. Research quality	.41***	.65***	.48***	.31***	-.09*	.01	.11**	.38***	.03	-.21***	.11**	-.05	.15***	.04	X

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 392 department chairs.

Table 38. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

Deans' Assessment--Publishing	Deans' Assessment--Teaching Not, Somewhat Important	Important*	Very Important
Not important	20	15	15
Somewhat important	13	32	44
Important	40	29	27
Very important	27	23	14
N	(30)	(145)	(206)

Tau b = -.11, significant at less than .01.

*Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 39. Relationships Among Deans' Department Assessment Factors[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Grants obtained	X														
2. Publications	.59***	X													
3. Papers delivered	.39***	.60***	X												
4. Conferences organized	.27***	.33***	-.03	X											
5. Enrollment	-.10***	-.12***	-.13***	.04*	X										
6. Teaching quality	-.30***	-.28***	.06*	-.03	.16***	X									
7. Internal reputation	-.01	.00	.30***	.12***	.17***	.26***	X								
8. External reputation	.37***	.41***	.02	.25***	-.07**	-.10***	.27***	X							
9. Student quality	-.06**	-.09***	-.06**	.12***	.15***	.41***	.28***	.14***	X						
10. Attrition	-.12***	-.18***	-.05*	.05*	.42***	.19***	.15***	-.05*	.31***	X					
11. Course quality	-.16***	-.20***	.03	.04	.18***	.35***	.23***	-.01	.42***	.32***	X				
12. Time for degree	-.07**	-.10***	.16***	.15***	.12***	.19***	.18***	.07**	.30***	.31***	.41***	X			
13. Fellowship awards to students	.18***	.12***	.01	.23***	.01	.11***	.17***	.26***	.34***	.15***	.26***	.37***	X		
14. Placement of graduates	-.04	-.10***	.46***	.11***	.11***	.27***	.21***	.12***	.42***	.24***	.35***	.27***	.46***	X	
15. Research quality	.48***	.63***	.27***	.28***	-.15***	-.12***	.06**	.41***	.06*	-.15***	-.09***	-.04	.23***	.06**	X

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 1,172 faculty.

Table 40. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

Deans' Assessment--Teaching	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)*			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Not important	8	4	7	8
Somewhat important	27	15	20	28
Important	31	34	39	35
Very important	33	47	33	28
N	(72)	(288)	(414)	(345)

Tau b = -.12, significant at less than .001.

*Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 41. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Faculty Sample

Deans' Assessment-- Research	Deans' Assessment--Publishing (%)*			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Not important	57	22	2	0
Somewhat important	32	54	23	4
Important	6	18	49	20
Very important	6	7	26	75
N	(72)	(288)	(414)	(345)

Tau b = .63, significant at less than .001.

*Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 42. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Faculty Sample

Deans' Assessment--Teaching	Deans' Assessment--Publishing (%) Not Important	Somewhat Important*	Important	Very Important
Not important	-5	-5	9	15
Somewhat important	10	13	25	37
Important	23	29	32	29
Very important	62	52	34	19
N	(78)	(245)	(409)	(395)

Tau b = -.28, significant at less than .001.

*Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 43. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Deans' Sample

	Factor Loadings After Varimax Rotation			
Variables	1	2	3	4
Extramural Grants	.752	.278	.087	-.195
Publications	.872	-.065	.015	-.056
Papers	.779	-.137	-.096	.259
Conferences	.394	.011	.113	.638
Enrollment	.097	-.190	.844	-.080
Teaching Quality	-.335	.147	.130	.707
Institutional Reputation	-.082	.357	.380	.112
National Reputation	.578	.408	.101	-.042
Student Quality	.013	.614	.061	.408
Attrition	-.094	.296	.641	.092
Courses	-.003	.197	.586	.324
Degree Time	-.136	.637	.348	-.196
Fellowships	.152	.753	-.127	.086
Placement	.180	.572	.196	.054
Research	.768	.070	-.140	.025

		Percentage of Variance Explained	
Factor	Eigenvalue	Each Factor	Cumulative
1	3.375	22.5	22.5
2	2.778	18.5	41.0
3	1.348	9.0	50.0
4	1.214	8.1	58.1

2TAB43
4/1/91

Table 44. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Chairs' Sample

Variables	Factor Loadings After Varimax Rotation 1	2	3	4
Extramural Grants	.731	.168	-.234	.024
Publications	.886	-.032	-.112	-.098
Papers	.845	-.041	.050	-.001
Conferences	.664	.086	.143	-.077
Enrollment	-.006	-.067	.051	.878
Teaching Quality	-.019	-.063	.851	-.077
Institutional Reputation	.172	.152	.559	.219
National Reputation	.582	.388	.085	-.076
Student Quality	.018	.518	.599	.017
Attrition	-.168	.364	.155	.708
Courses	-.169	.368	.585	.184
Degree Time	-.071	.630	.123	.208
Fellowships	.241	.792	-.035	-.015
Placement	.098	.648	.213	.013
Research	.779	-.029	.079	-.184

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance Explained Each Factor	Cumulative
1	3.742	24.9	24.9
2	3.028	20.2	45.1
3	1.264	8.4	53.6
4	1.136	7.6	61.1

2TAB44
4/1/91

Table 45. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Faculty Sample

	Factor Loadings After Varimax Rotation			
Variables	1	2	3	4
Extramural Grants	.757	-.041	-.150	-.123
Publications	.867	-.144	-.131	-.046
Papers	.815	.032	.174	-.100
Conferences	.663	.158	.294	-.076
Enrollment	-.057	-.017	.801	.234
Teaching Quality	-.322	.280	.151	.601
Institutional Reputation	.131	.111	.115	.806
National Reputation	.631	.135	-.225	.334
Student Quality	.007	.596	.109	.479
Attrition	-.097	.360	.715	.027
Courses	-.166	.625	.251	.259
Degree Time	-.016	.691	.238	-.041
Fellowships	.283	.759	-.123	.003
Placement	.010	.710	-.005	.235
Research	.760	.039	-.272	.138

		Percentage of Variance Explained	
Factor	Eigenvalue	Each Factor	Cumulative
1	3.78	25.2	25.2
2	3.36	22.4	47.6
3	1.24	8.3	55.9
4	1.05	7.0	62.9

2TAB45
4/1/91

Table 46. Relationships Among Tenure Weights and Merit Salary Awards, Deans' Sample[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Tenure Weights									
1. Teaching	X								
2. Research	-.17*	X							
3. Publications	-.59***	.15*	X						
4. Organizational service	.38***	-.35***	-.50***	X					
5. Professional organization service	-.04	-.05	.22**	-.11	X				
6. Community service	.22**	-.10	-.18**	.31***	-.12	X			
Merit Salary Awards									
7. Teaching	-.16*	.09	.14*	-.16*	.01	.10	X		
8. Research	-.20**	.17*	.24**	-.23**	-.02	.14*	.85***	X	
9. Public Service	.09	-.02	-.01	.04	-.10	-.17*	.46***	.46***	X

*** Significant at less than .001.
** Significant at less than .01.
* Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.

Table 47. Relationships Among Tenure Weights and Merit Salary Awards, Chairs' Sample[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Tenure Weights									
1. Teaching	X								
2. Research	-.38***	X							
3. Publications	-.49***	.34***	X						
4. Organizational service	.34***	-.39***	-.38***	X					
5. Professional organization service	-.03	.02	.05	.06	X				
6. Community service	.20***	-.09*	-.24***	.35***	.06	X			
Merit Salary Awards									
7. Teaching	-.09*	.15***	.14**	-.12**	.04	-.05	X		
8. Research	-.28***	.31***	.39***	-.32***	-.03	-.20***	-.68***	X	
9. Public Service	.06	.05	.05	.05	-.12**	.06	.46***	.44***	X

*** Significant at less than .001.
** Significant at less than .01.
* Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 392 department chairs.

Table 48. Relationships Among Tenure Weights and Merit Salary Awards, Faculty Sample[a]

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Tenure Weights									
1. Teaching	X								
2. Research	-.44***	X							
3. Publications	-.59***	.30***	X						
4. Institutional service	.35***	-.37***	-.38***	X					
5. Professional organization service	-.07*	.07**	.05*	-.05*	X				
6. Community service	.29***	-.20***	-.30***	.35***	-.03	X			
Merit Salary Awards									
7. Teaching	.14***	.00	-.01	-.04	-.01	-.03	X		
8. Research	-.30***	.28***	.39***	-.32***	.00	-.25***	.46***	X	
9. Public Service	.09***	-.02	-.06*	.03	-.05*	.09***	.45***	.29***	X

*** Significant at less than .001.
** Significant at less than .01.
* Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 1,172 faculty.

Table 49. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

Tenure Weight for Teaching	Tenure Weight for Research (%)[a]					
	Highest Weight	Second Weight	Third Weight	Fourth Weight	Fifth Weight	Lowest Weight
Highest weight	5	43	75	76	93	87
Second weight	40	0	23	13	4	13
Third weight	46	45	0	9	1	0
Fourth weight or lower	8	12	2	2	1	0
N	(181)	(435)	(267)	(120)	(72)	(45)

Tau b = -.44, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 50. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

Tenure Weight for Publishing	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)[a]			
	Highest Weight	Second Weight	Third Weight	Fourth Weight or Lower
Highest weight	2	73	71	78
Second weight	36	0	28	19
Third weight	24	18	0	1
Fourth weight	16	4	1	0
Fifth weight	13	2	0	0
Lowest weight	10	2	0	1
N	591)	(157)	(293)	(74)

Tau b = -.59, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 51. Tenure Weight for Institutional Service by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)[a]			
Tenure Weight for Institutional Service	Highest Weight	Second Weight	Third Weight	Fourth Weight or Lower
First, second weight	39	8	5	10
Third weight	20	36	0	43
Fourth weight	29	45	63	14
Fifth, sixth weight	12	12	32	33
N	(599)	(160)	(281)	(70)

Tau b = .35, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 52. Tenure Weight for Community Service by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)[a]			
Tenure Weight for Community Service	Highest Weight	Second Weight	Third Weight	Fourth Weight or Lower
First, second weight	5	4	1	1
Third weight	19	5	0	6
Fourth weight	15	13	6	7
Fifth weight	20	29	12	22
Lowest weight	42	49	81	63
N	(586)	(154)	(280)	(71)

Tau b = .29, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 53. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Merit Salary Awards for Teaching (%)*	
Tenure Weight for Teaching	No	Yes
Fourth weight or lower	10	3
Third weight	28	23
Second weight	14	15
Highest weight	47	59
N	(550)	(546)

Tau b = .14, significant at less than .001.

*Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 54. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

	Merit Salary Awards for Research (%)*	
Tenure Weight for Teaching	No	Yes
Fourth weight or lower	4	8
Third weight	11	34
Second weight	10	18
Highest weight	75	41
N	(387)	(712)

Tau b = -.30, significant at less than .001.

*Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 55. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

	Merit Salary Awards for Research (%)	
Merit Salary Awards for Teaching	No	Yes
No	82	34
Yes	18	66
N	(395)	(717)

Tau b = .46, significant at less than .001.

Table 56. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Deans' Sample

	Factor Loadings After Varimax Rotation		
Variables	1	2	3
Tenure - Teaching	.769	.066	-.151
Tenure - Research	-.457	.023	-.705
Tenure - Publication	-.852	-.079	.248
Tenure - Institutional Service	.794	.039	.201
Tenure - Professional Organizations	-.214	.095	.727
Tenure - Community Service	.540	.055	.157
Merit Pay - Teaching	.179	.893	.020
Merit Pay - Research	.282	.877	.085
Merit Pay - Public Service	-.201	.757	.013

		Percentage of Variance Explained	
Factor	Eigenvalue	Each Factor	Cumulative
1	2.888	32.1	32.1
2	1.943	21.6	53.7
3	1.160	12.9	66.6

Table 57. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Chairs' Sample

	Factor Loadings After Varimax Rotation		
Variables	1	2	3
Tenure - Teaching	.750	-.063	-.116
Tenure - Research	-.702	-.159	-.076
Tenure - Publication	-.808	-.125	.001
Tenure - Institutional Service	.739	.132	.296
Tenure - Professional Organizations	-.015	.041	.908
Tenure - Community Service	.503	-.020	.481
Merit Pay - Teaching	.134	.861	-.125
Merit Pay - Research	.474	.755	.014
Merit Pay - Public Service	-.141	.799	.182

		Percentage of Variance Explained	
Factor	Eigenvalue	Each Factor	Cumulative
1	3.192	35.5	35.5
2	1.679	18.7	54.1
3	1.126	12.5	66.6

Table 58. Factor Analysis of Variables in Tenure and Merit Pay Decisions, Faculty Sample

	Factors		
Variables	1	2	3
Tenure - Teaching	.749	-.156	-.188
Tenure - Research	-.739	-.047	-.011
Tenure - Publication	-.831	-.038	-.005
Tenure - Institutional Service	.749	.068	-.012
Tenure - Professional Organizations	.012	.016	.972
Tenure - Community Service	.664	-.008	.230
Merit Pay - Teaching	-.014	.859	.028
Merit Pay - Research	.540	.642	-.020
Merit Pay - Public Service	-.115	.779	.008

		Percentage of Variance Explained	
Factor	Eigenvalue	Each Factor	Cumulative
1	3.149	35.0	35.0
2	1.750	19.4	54.4
3	1.030	11.4	65.9

Table 59. Relationships Among Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample[a]

Resource Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Travel to conferences	X													
2. Travel to develop grants	.46***	X												
3. Research by senior professors	.32***	.37***	X											
4. Research by untenured professors	.31***	.36***	.77***	X										
5. Purchase of computer equipment	.29***	.24***	.24***	.26***	X									
6. Purchase of research equipment	.30***	.25***	.30***	.33***	.49***	X								
7. Purchase of library books	.25***	.12**	.15***	.17***	.18***	.27***	X							
8. Purchase of library journals	.19***	.15***	.11**	.16***	.22***	.30***	.63***	X						
9. Personnel for grant development	.20***	.30***	.32***	.27***	.10*	.18***	.07	.13**	X					
10. Offering courses frequently enough	.16***	.15***	.06	.10*	.16***	.16***	.16***	.22***	.07	X				
11. Student research assistants	.15***	.22***	.23***	.26***	.17***	.26***	.16***	.18***	.26***	.21***	X			
12. Student teaching assistants	.18***	.15**	.19***	.25***	.21***	.24***	.20***	.20***	.14**	.25***	.43***	X		
13. Sabbaticals to improve teaching	.24***	.09*	.11**	.10*	.17***	.13**	.15***	.11**	.11**	.17***	.06	.16***	X	
14. Sabbaticals to do publishable research	.24***	.12**	.23***	.30***	.17***	.15***	.19***	.16***	.17***	.18***	.11*	.24***	.69***	X

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 392 department chairs.

Table 60. Relationships Among Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample[a]

Resource Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Travel to conferences	X													
Travel to develop grants	.44	X												
Research by senior professors	.35	.40	X											
Research by untenured professors	.31	.34	.61	X										
Purchase of computer equipment	.32	.31	.27	.25	X									
Purchase of research equipment	.34	.38	.39	.37	.45	X								
Purchase of library books	.28	.20	.20	.17	.25	.31	X							
Purchase of library journals	.23	.19	.19	.18	.24	.34	.70	X						
Personnel for grant development	.16	.27	.22	.18	.19	.23	.13	.16	X					
Offering courses frequently enough	.19	.11	.14	.15	.15	.16	.24	.23	.12	X				
Student research assistants	.22	.22	.28	.31	.22	.31	.20	.21	.17	.21	X			
Student teaching assistants	.14	.15	.19	.26	.13	.19	.16	.19	.12	.23	.50	X		
Sabbaticals to improve teaching	.26	.19	.18	.16	.13	.15	.17	.13	.15	.17	.17	.15	X	
Sabbaticals to do publishable research	.25	.22	.22	.28	.14	.22	.18	.16	.15	.19	.20	.24	.65	X

[a]Correlations are tau b. All correlations are significant at less than .001.

N = 1,172 faculty.

Table 61. Factor Analysis of Adequacy of Resources, Chairs' Sample

	Factors			
Variables	1	2	3	4
Conference Travel	.531	.267	.345	.004
Grant Travel	.671	.125	.049	.090
Research - Senior Professors	.841	.095	.080	.046
Research - Untenured Professors	.802	.178	.105	.110
Computers	.331	.514	.173	.055
Research Equipment	.418	.548	.091	.182
Library Books	.033	.844	.100	.092
Library Journals	.019	.847	-.009	.211
Grant Personnel	.534	-.093	-.033	.282
Courses	-.058	.243	.239	.543
Student Research Associates	.308	.072	-.110	.764
Student Teaching Associates	.157	.154	.154	.752
Sabbaticals - Teaching	.018	.067	.917	.088
Sabbaticals - Research	.224	.117	.857	.126

		Percentage of Variance Explained	
Factor	Eigenvalue	Each Factor	Cumulative
1	4.331	30.9	30.9
2	1.642	11.7	42.7
3	1.463	10.5	53.1
4	1.144	8.2	61.3

Table 62. Factor Analysis of Adequacy of Resources, Faculty Sample

	Factors			
Variables	1	2	3	4
Conference Travel	.599	.230	.054	.247
Grant Travel	.737	.095	.033	.134
Research - Senior Professors	.723	-.072	.305	.091
Research - Untenured Professors	.660	-.101	.431	.109
Computers	.600	.320	-.002	-.030
Research Equipment	.689	.285	.162	.003
Library Books	.238	.853	.065	.100
Library Journals	.235	.850	.129	.020
Grant Personnel	.389	.126	.035	.152
Courses	.002	.461	.388	.179
Student Research Associates	.271	.152	.764	.072
Student Teaching Associates	.092	.127	.833	.138
Sabbaticals - Teaching	.138	.115	.088	.900
Sabbaticals - Research	.216	.051	.185	.861

		Percentage of Variance Explained	
Factor	Eigenvalue	Each Factor	Cumulative
1	4.684	33.5	33.5
2	1.459	10.4	43.9
3	1.362	9.7	53.6
4	1.137	8.1	61.7

2TAB62
5/17/89

Table 63. Relationships Among Deans' Performance Variables, Deans' Sample[a]

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Influence of committees	X				
2. Deans' impact on educational quality	.30***	X			
3. Deans' management style[b]	.29***	.38***	X		
Deans' Communication:					
4. With chairs	.10	.10	.19**	X	
5. With faculty	.21**	.26***	.40***	.23***	X

***Significant at less than .001.

** Significant at less than .01.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.

[b] Low faculty participation = 1; high faculty participation = 10.

Table 64. Relationships Among Deans' Performance Variables, Chairs' Sample[a]

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Influence of committees	X				
2. Deans' impact on educational quality	.18***	X			
3. Deans' management style[b]	.12***	.36***	X		
Deans' Communication:					
4. With chairs	.12**	.35***	.53***	X	
5. With faculty	.16***	.35***	.49***	.58***	X

***Significant at less than .001.

** Significant at less than .01.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 392 department chairs.

[b] Low faculty participation = 1; high faculty participation = 10.

Table 65. Relationships Among Deans Performance Variables, Faculty Sample[a]

	1	2	3	4
1. Influence of Committees	X			
2. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality	.28	X		
3. Deans' Management Style[b]	.24	.39	X	
4. Deans' Communications with Faculty	.30	.39	.63	X

[a] Correlations are tau b. All are significant at less than .001. N = 1,172 faculty.

[b] Low faculty participation = 1, high faculty participation = .10.

Table 66. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Management Style, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Management Style (%)[a]				
Deans' Impact on Educational Quality	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
None	36	11	3	2	5
Limited	46	67	57	31	24
Fairly much	10	18	33	53	38
Very much	8	4	7	14	33
N	(185)	(202)	(314)	(314)	(98)

Tau b = .39, significant at less than .001.

[a] 1 = low faculty participation; 10 = high faculty participation.

Table 67. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Communications with Faculty, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Communication with Faculty (%)[a]				
Deans' Impact on Educational Quality	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
None	32	8	2	2	1
Limited	49	63	54	34	20
Fairly much	11	25	36	50	45
Very much	8	4	8	14	34
N	(240)	(228)	(281)	(260)	(113)

Tau b = .39, significant at less than .001.

[a] 1 = low faculty participation; 10 = high faculty participation.

Table 68. Influence of Faculty Committees by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching[a]			
Influence of Faculty Committees	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Not influential	55	25	14	7
Somewhat influential	32	49	45	36
Influential	11	21	32	37
Very influential	1	4	8	20
N	(80)	(240)	(406)	(397)

Tau b = .30, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 69. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)[a]			
Deans' Impact on Educational Quality	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
None	36	14	8	3
Limited	49	54	49	40
Fairly much	9	27	35	39
Very much	7	6	8	18
N	(76)	(236)	(406)	(392)

Tau b = .25, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 70. Deans' Management Style by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)[a]			
Deans' Management Style[b]	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
1-2	61	24	12	7
3-4	14	18	21	15
5-6	14	30	30	28
7-8	9	21	28	37
9-10	1	7	8	13
N	(77)	(235)	(400)	(385)

Tau b = .25, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

[b] 1 = Low faculty participation; 10 = High faculty participation.

Table 71. Deans' Communication with Faculty by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)[a]			
Deans' Communication with Faculty[b]	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
1-2	72	29	19	8
3-4	10	25	22	18
5-6	13	26	28	24
7-8	5	14	24	32
9-10	0	5	7	19
N	(78)	(236)	(403)	(391)

Tau b = .31, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

[b] 1 = Low communication; 10 = High communication.

Table 72. Relationships Among Department Chairs' Performance Variables[a]

	Respondents	
	Faculty	Department Chairs
Chair's Impact x Chair's Management Style[b]	.42***	.16**
Chair's Impact x Chair's Communication with Faculty	.38***	.13**
Chair's Management Style x Chair's Communication with Faculty	.66***	.43***

***Significnt at less than .001.

**Significant at less than .01.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 392 department chairs and 1,172 faculty.

[b] Low faculty participation = 1; high faculty participation = 10.

Table 73. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Chairs' Management Style, Faculty Sample

	Chairs' Management Style (%)[a]				
Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
None	36	12	5	2	2
Limited	39	57	56	32	15
Fairly much	17	26	33	52	42
Very much	7	6	5	14	41
N	(94)	(145)	(207)	(361)	(312)

Tau b = .42, significant at less than .001.

[a] 1 = Low faculty participation; 10 = high faculty participation. Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 74. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Chairs' Communication with Faculty, Faculty Sample

Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality	Chairs' Communication with Faculty (%)[a]				
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
None	30	15	8	2	1
Limited	44	54	49	38	20
Fairly much	19	26	35	46	44
Very much	8	4	8	13	34
N	(107)	(112)	(183)	(326)	(402)

Tau b = .38, significant at less than .01.

[a] 1 = Low faculty participation; 10 = high faculty participation. Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 75. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Impact on Educational Quality, Chairs' Sample

Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality	Deans' Impact on Educational Quality (%)		
	None, Limited	Fairly Much	Very Much[a]
None, limited	48	24	23
Fairly much	41	61	45
Very Much	11	15	31
N =	(169)	(150)	(64)

Tau b = .24, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 76. Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality by Deans' Impact on Educational Quality, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Impact on Educational Quality (%)[a]			
Chairs' Impact on Educational Quality	None	Limited	Fairly Much	Very Much
None	26	7	2	3
Limited	42	44	27	19
Fairly much	20	39	50	30
Very much	13	11	20	48
N	(110)	(526)	(366)	(122)

Tau b = .29, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 77. Chairs' Management Style by Deans' Management Style, Chairs' Sample

	Deans' Management Style (%)[a]			
Chairs' Management Style	1-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
1-6	30	29	14	18
7-8	46	45	61	29
9-10	24	26	25	53
N	(74)	(97)	(144)	(68)

Tau b = .17***, significant at less than .001.

[a]1 = :Low faculty participation; 10 = High faculty participation.

Table 78. Chairs' Management Style by Deans' Management Style, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Management Style (%)[a], [b]				
Chairs' Management Style	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
1-2	20	10	5	4	3
3-4	18	22	11	8	9
5-6	18	16	23	16	15
7-8	18	33	38	39	17
9-10	25	18	22	33	56
N	(185)	(201)	(319)	(311)	(99)

Tau b = .22, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

[b] 1 = Low faculty participation; 10 = High faculty participation.

Table 79. Chairs' Communication with Faculty by Deans' Communication with Faculty, Chairs' Sample

Chairs' Communication with Faculty[a]	Deans' Communication with Faculty (%)			
	1-4	5-6[b]	7-8	9-10
1-6	15	14	4	3
7-8	41	43	42	17
9-10	44	44	54	80
N	(93)	(115)	(115)	(60)

Tau b =.26, significant at less than .001.

[a] 1 = Lowest communication; 2 = Highest communication.

[b] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 80. Chairs' Communication with Faculty by Deans' Communication with Faculty, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Communication with Faculty (%)[a,b]				
Chairs' Communication with Faculty	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10
1-2	24	9	6	3	4
3-4	12	18	8	6	4
5-6	17	20	19	13	5
7-8	22	27	36	36	15
9-10	25	27	31	43	73
N	(242)	(229)	(284)	(256)	(114)

Tau b = .27, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

[b] 1 = Low communication; 10 = High communication.

Table 81. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Deans' Characteristics, Teaching Variables and Resource Adequacy[a]

	Institutional Characteristics				
	FTE Faculty in Department	FTE Graduate Students	FTE Undergrad. Students	Highest Degree Offered	Private/ Public
Deans' Characteristics					
Tenure status[b]	.22**	.24**	.24**	.26***	.17*
Gender[c]	.06	-.08	-.02	-.03	-.12
Race	-.01	-.12	.05	-.11	.15*
Teaching Variables					
Teaching load	-.15*	-.16*	-.15*	-.40***	-.03
Percentage courses by part-timers	.19**	.00	.13	.09	.13
Percentage time teaching	-.13	-.33***	-.12	-.40***	.01
Dean's teaching	-.12	.03	.05	-.06	-.02
Resource Adequacy and Faculty Salary					
Faculty salary	.22**	.07	.05	.10	-.04
Travel to conferences	.11	-.01	.07	.01	-.25***
Travel to develop grants	.10	.21***	.14*	.02	-.12
Research by senior professors	.13*	.12	.02	.22**	-.12
Research by untenured professors	.26***	.27**	.19**	.32***	-.11
Purchase of computer equipment	.02	.03	.00	.05	-.21**
Purchase of research equipment	.09	.17*	.16*	.16*	-.12
Purchase of library books	.00	.03	-.01	-.06	-.16*
Purchase of library journals	.02	.07	.11	.01	-.22**
Personnel for grant development	.13*	.14*	.17*	.19**	-.03
Offering courses frequently enough	-.01	-.06	-.09	-.03	-.09
Student research assistants	-.02	.14*	.02	.11	-.13*
Student teaching assistants	.21**	.14*	.12	.19*	-.05
Sabbaticals to improve teaching	.02	-.05	-.06	-.11	-.12*
Sabbaticals to do publishable research	.16*	.09	.11	.10	-.09

***Significant at less than .001. **Significant at less than .01. *Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.
[b] Tenured = 1; Untenured = 2.
[c] Male = 1; Female = 2.
[d] Non-whites = 1; White Non-Hispanic = 2.

Table 82. Relationships Between Department Characteristics and Deans' Department Assessment Factors[a]

Deans' Department Assessment Factors	Department Characteristics: FTE Faculty	Department Characteristics: Undergraduate Sect. Offered Fall 1984	Department Characteristics: Graduate Sect. Offered Fall 1984	Department Characteristics: Total Sections Offered Fall 1984
1. Grants obtained	.31***	.11**	.32***	.14***
2. Publications	.39***	.19***	.42***	.23***
3. Papers delivered	.25***	.18***	.22***	.19***
4. Conferences organized	.18***	.14**	.07	.12**
5. Enrollment	-.11**	-.03	-.08	-.06
6. Teaching quality	-.17***	-.07	-.14**	-.12**
7. Internal reputation	-.16***	-.11**	-.03	-.08
8. External reputation	.22***	.06	.27***	.12
9. Student quality	-.01	-.05	-.03	-.05
10. Attrition	-.19***	-.07	-.20***	-.11**
11. Course quality	-.14**	-.09*	-.13**	-.11**
12. Time for degree	-.01	-.07	-.04	-.06
13. Fellowship awards to students	.11**	.03	.04	.01
14. Placement of graduates	-.05	-.12**	-.08*	-.11*
15. Research quality	.36***	.14**	.35***	.20***

***Significant at less than .001. **Significant at less than .01. *Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 392 department chairs.

Table 83. Relationships Between Department Characteristics and Deans' Priorities, Formal Rewards, Deans' Performance, and Chairs' Performance[a]

	Department Characteristics			
	FTE Faculty	Fall 1984 Undergrad. Sections Offered	Fall 1984 Graduate Sections Offered	Fall 1984 Total Sections Offered
Deans' Priorities (as reported by chairs)				
Upgrade inferior programs	-.09*	-.07	-.12*	-.09*
Maintain outstanding programs	.10*	.06	.08	.11*
Formal Rewards - Tenure Weights				
Teaching	-.37***	-.10*	-.41***	-.18***
Research	.28***	.05	.24***	.10*
Publications	.41***	.22***	.36***	.25***
Institutional Service	-.32***	-.17***	-.35***	-.21***
Professional organization service	.03	.01	.00	.05
Community service	-.15***	-.11**	-.18***	-.12**
Formal Rewards - Merit Salary Awards				
Teaching	.17***	.11*	.18***	.14**
Research	.31***	.14**	.29***	.16***
Public service	.09*	.05	.06	.05
Deans' Performance (as reported by chairs)				
Influence on committees	-.06	-.08*	-.14**	-.08*
Deans' inpact on educational quality	-.09*	-.02	-.06	-.04
Deans' management style[b]	-.03	-.10*	.00	-.07
Deans' communication with chairs[c]	.06	.04	.05	.05
Deans' communication with faculty[c]	-.10*	-.08	-.06	-.09*
Chairs' Performance				
Chairs' impact on educational quality	-.11*	-.03	-.04	-.06
Chairs' management style[b]	.04	.01	.01	.01
Chairs' communication[c]	.03	.05	-.02	.02

***Significant at less than .001. **Significant at less than .01. *Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 392 department chairs.
[b] Low faculty participation = 1; high faculty participation = 10.
[c] Low communication = 1; high communication = 10.

Table 84. Relationships Between Department Characteristics and Chairs' Characteristics, Teaching Variables and Resource Adequacy[a]

	Department Characteristics			
	FTE Faculty	Undergraduate Sect. Offered Fall 1984	Graduate Sect. Offered Fall 1984	Total Sections Offered Fall 1984
Chairs' Characteristics				
Tenure status[b]	.13**	.04	.11*	.10*
Gender[c]	.04	.06	.08*	.02
Race	-.04	.04	-.11*	.05
Teaching Variables				
Teaching load	-.24***	.01	-.30***	-.10*
Percentage courses by part-timers	.06	.24***	.00	.18***
Percentage time teaching	-.31***	-.11**	-.35***	-.16***
Chairs' teaching	-.32***	-.16***	-.30***	-.19***
Resource Adequacy				
Faculty salary	.13**	.06	.13**	.09*
Travel to conferences	.00	-.08*	.02	-.04
Travel to develop grants	.07	-.01	.07	.03
Research by senior professors	.12**	.03	.14**	.08*
Research by untenured professors	.22***	.04	.24***	.11**
Purchase of computer equipment	.12**	-.05	.10*	-.01
Purchase of research equipment	.08*	-.01	.09*	.03
Purchase of library books	-.01	-.01	-.05	.00
Purchase of library journals	.00	-.08*	.05	-.02
Personnel for grant development	.11**	.03	.09*	.06
Offering courses frequently enough	.04	-.09*	.01	-.08*
Student research assistants	-.05	-.17***	-.01	-.16***
Student teaching assistants	.08	-.11**	.09*	-.07
Sabbaticals to improve teaching	-.09	-.06	-.14***	-.07
Sabbaticals to do publish. research	.08	-.01	.01	.03

***Significant at less than .001. **Significant at less than .01. *Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 392 department chairs.
[b] Tenured = 1; Untenured = 2.
[c] Male = 1; Female = 2.
[d] Non-whites = 1; White Non-Hispanic = 2.

Table 85. Relationships Between Selected Deans' Characteristics and Deans' Performance Variables[a]

	Deans' Characteristics		
Deans' Performance Variables	Tenure Status[b]	Gender[c]	Race[d]
Deans' impact on educational quality	.00	.05	.04
Deans' management style[e]	.05	.04	.01
Deans' communication with chairs	.05	-.18**	.07
Deans' communication with faculty	-.03	.03	-.01

**Significant at less than .01.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.

[b] Tenured = 1; Untenured = 2.

[c] Male = 1; Female = 2.

[d] Non-white = 1; White Non-Hispanic = 2..

[e] Low faculty participation = 1; High Faculty Participation = 10.

Table 86. Relationships Between Selected Chairs' Characteristics and Chairs' Performance Variables[a]

	Deans' Characteristics		
Chairs' Performance Variables	Tenure Status[b]	Gender[c]	Race[d]
Chairs' impact on educational quality	-.09*	.12**	.06
Chairs' management style[e]	-.03	.14**	.11*
Chairs' communication with faculty	-.06	.09*	.05

**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 392 chairs.

[b] Tenured = 1; Untenured = 2.

[c] Male = 1; Female = 2.

[d] Non-white = 1; White Non-Hispanic = 2..

[e] Low Faculty Participation = 1; High Faculty Participation = 10.

Table 87. Relationships Between Deans' Performance and Deans' Department Assessment Factors[a]

Deans' Department Assessment Factors	Deans' Performance				
	Committee Influence	Deans' Impact	Management Style[b]	Communication with Chairs	Communication with Faculty
1. Grants obtained	-.14*	-.03	-.05	.12	-.06
2. Publications	-.01	-.08	-.02	.16*	.05
3. Papers delivered	.10	.01	.10	.18**	.06
4. Conferences organized	.16*	.16*	.19**	.17*	.12
5. Enrollment	.07	-.02	-.02	.02	.10
6. Teaching quality	.05	.24**	.21**	.17*	.10
7. Internal reputation	.11	.16*	.11	.18**	.10
8. External reputation	.03	.02	-.03	.15*	-.08
9. Student quality	.08	.20**	.17*	.20**	.10
10. Attrition	.15*	.16*	.04	-.03	.09
11. Course quality	.17*	.20**	.09	.16*	.21**
12. Time for degree	.02	.09	.06	.02	.03
13. Fellowship awards to students	-.03	-.02	-.01	.10	.08
14. Placement of graduates	.08	.11	.03	.21**	.08
15. Research quality	.02	-.02	.04	.08	.09

**Significant at less than .01. *Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.

[b] Low faculty participation = 1; high faculty participation = 10.

Table 88. Relationships Between Selected Resource Adequacy Variables and Deans' Ratings of Departmental Teaching Quality[a]

	Resource Adequacy				
Department	Library Books	Library Journals	Course Scheduling	Teaching Assistants	Sabbaticals to Improve Teaching
Biology	.16	.07	.08	.11	-.03
Chemistry	.03	.06	.05	.11	.00
English	.10	.08	.06	.15	.14
History	-.01	.11	-.13	.18*	.21*
Mathematics	.22*	.21*	.05	.21*	.10
Music	.18*	.17	-.08	.01	-.16
Political Science	-.06	-.13	-.07	.08	-.10
Psychology	-.11	-.23*	.03	.06	-.06
Sociology	.01	.04	-.12	-.05	-.18*

*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.

Table 89. Department Teaching Quality by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)			
Department Teaching Quality	Not Important	Somewhat Important[a]	Important	Very Important
Fair	33	22	10	3
Good	56	57	68	62
Outstanding	11	20	22	35
N	(79)	(244)	(409)	(395)

Tau b = .23, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 90. Department Teaching Quality by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Merit Salary Awards for Teaching (%)	
Department Teaching Quality	No	Yes
Fair	17	8
Good	63	62
Outstanding	20	30
N	(566)	(549)

Tau b = .15, significant at less than .001.

Table 91. Relationships Between Selected Resource Adequacy Variables and Deans' Ratings of Departmental Research Quality[a]

	Resource Adequacy						
Department	Travel to Obtain Grants	Untenured Faculty Research	Senior Faculty Research	Computers	Research Equipment	Grant Personnel	Sabbaticals for Research
Biology	.02	.02	.02	-.02	.11	.02	-.01
Chemistry	.03	.14	.02	.02	.28**	-.09	-.23**
English	.18*	-.01	.08	.01	.09	.00	.09
History	.26**	.11	.15	-.04	.00	.05	.22**
Mathematics	.00	.13	.14	-.02	-.02	.02	.11
Music	.16	-.13	-.02	-.06	.06	-.10	-.01
Political Science	.11	.08	.11	-.09	.06	-.10	.10
Psychology	-.06	-.07	.00	-.03	-.02	-.03	-.03
Sociology	.03	-.06	-.01	-.11	.10	-.01	-.03

**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.

Table 92. Department Research Quality by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)			
Department Research Quality	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important[a]
Inferior	38	18	9	4
Fair	37	54	38	27
Good	22	25	45	49
Outstanding	3	3	8	21
N	(71)	(285)	(414)	(342)

Tau b = .33, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 93. Department Research Quality by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

	Merit Salary Awards for Research (%)	
Department Research Quality	No	Yes
Inferior	20	7
Fair	49	34
Good	27	45
Outstanding	4	14
N	(390)	(722)

Tau b = .28, significant at less than .001.

Table 94. Department Teaching Quality by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

Department Teaching Quality	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)[a] 4th Weight or Lower	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Fair	32	14	12	9
Good	51	61	66	64
Outstanding	16	24	22	28
N	(74)	(289)	(165)	(604)

Tau b = .11, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 95. Department Research Quality by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

Department Research Quality	Tenure Weight for Research (%)[a] Lowest Weight	Fifth Weight	Fourth Weight	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Inferior	31	31	15	14	6	6
Fair	44	40	42	43	39	26
Good	20	27	38	36	44	45
Outstanding	4	1	6	8	11	22
N	(45)	(70)	(120)	(262)	(433)	(179)

Tau b = .23, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 96. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Deans' Priorities, Formal Rewards, and Deans' Performance[a]

	Institutional Characteristics				
	FTE Faculty in Dept.	FTE Graduate Students	FTE Undergrad. Students	Highest Degree Offered	Private/ Public
Deans' Priorities					
Upgrade inferior programs	-.14	-.12	-.11	-.20**	-.19*
Maintain outstanding programs	.00	.12	.13	.14*	.15*
Formal Rewards - Tenure Weights					
Teaching	-.35***	-.29***	-.17*	-.47***	-.10
Research	.16*	.16*	.07	.14*	.03
Publications	.23**	.28***	.21**	.43***	.21**
Institutional service	-.35***	-.23**	-.18**	-.28***	-.22**
Professional organizations	.03	-.05	-.04	.05	.07
Community service	-.19**	-.15*	-.11	-.15*	-.02
Formal Rewards - Merit Salary Awards					
Teaching	.07	.20**	.00	.29***	.09
Research	.12	.24**	.09	.34***	.07
Public service	.03	.04	.07	.05	.20**
Deans' Performance					
Influence of committees	.00	-.11	.01	-.22**	-.04
Deans' impact on educational quality	-.14*	-.15*	-.06	-.20**	-.04
Deans' management style	-.03	-.15*	-.02	-.15*	.05
Deans' communication with chairs	.03	.00	.10	-.01	.20**
Deans' communication with faculty	-.08	-.14*	-.08	-.11	-.03

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.

Table 97. Deans' Priorities--Upgrading Inferior Departments by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

Deans' Priorities--Upgrading Inferior Departments	Highest Degree(%) Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
Fourth Priority	62	57	84
Second or Third Priority	19	26	13
Highest Priority	19	17	3
N	(26)	(54)	(38)

Tau b = -.20, significant at less than .01.

Table 98. Deans' Priorities--Maintaining Outstanding Departments by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

Deans' Priorities--Maintaining Outstanding Departments	Highest Degree(%) Bachelor's	Master's[a]	Doctorate
Third or Fourth Priority	14	18	7
Second Priority	25	21	14
Highest Priority	61	62	79
N	(28)	(63)	(43)

Tau b = .14, significant at less than .05.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 99. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

	Highest Degree(%)		
Tenure Weight for Teaching	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
Second Weight or Lower	4	9	56
Highest Weight	96	91	44
N	(28)	(64)	(45)

Tau b = -.47, significant at less than .001.

Table 100. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

Tenure Weight for Publishing	Highest Degree(%)		
	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
Fourth Weight or Lower	59	32	9
Third Weight	24	33	25
Second Weight	14	29	20
Highest Weight	3	6	46
N	(29)	(63)	(44)

Tau b = .43, significant at less than .001.

Table 101. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

	Highest Degree(%)		
Merit Salary Awards for Teaching	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
No	38	34	4
Yes	62	66	96
N	(29)	(65)	(46)

Tau b = .29, significant at less than .001.

Table 102. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

Merit Salary Awards for Research	Highest Degree(%) Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
No	41	34	2
Yes	59	66	98
N	(29)	(64)	(46)

Tau b = .34, significant at less than .001.

Table 103. Committee Influence by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

Committee Influence	Highest Degree(%)[a] Bachelor's	 Master's	 Doctorate
None, some influence	17	23	37
Influential	33	56	44
Very influential	50	21	20
N	(30)	(66)	(46)

Tau b = -.22, significant at less than .01.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 104. Deans' Impact on Educational Quality by Institution's Highest Degree, Deans' Sample

	Highest Degree(%)[a]		
Deans' Impact	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
None, limited	17	26	44
Fairly much	47	61	37
Very much	37	14	20
N	(30)	(66)	(46)

Tau b = -.20, significant at less than .01.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 105. Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Student Attrition by Deans' Race, Deans' Sample

Deans' Assessment-- Student Attrition	Deans' Race (%) White, Non-Hispanic[a]	 Minority
Not, Somewhat Important	45	8
Important	46	38
Very Important	10	54
N	(125)	(13)

Tau b = .31, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 106. Relationships Between Institutional Characteristics and Deans' Department Assessment Factors[a]

	Institutional Characteristics				
Deans' Department Assessment Factors	FTE Faculty in Dept.	FTE Graduate Students	FTE Undergrad. Students	Highest Degree Offered	Private/ Public
1. Grants obtained	.20**	.31***	.08	.36***	.23**
2. Publications	.31***	.36***	.21**	.47***	.15*
3. Papers delivered	.24**	.25***	.28***	.20**	.13
4. Conferences organized	.10	-.02	.02	-.08	.06
5. Enrollment	.03	-.03	-.21**	-.11	.02
6. Teaching quality	.11	-.22**	-.12	-.13	-.11
7. Internal reputation	-.09	-.10	-.03	-.08	.02
8. External reputation	.20**	.19**	.09	.14*	.14*
9. Student quality	-.05	.07	.06	.02	.09
10. Attrition	-.11	-.06	-.15*	-.17*	-.02
11. Course quality	-.05	-.02	-.12	-.05	-.09
12. Time for degree	-.17*	-.09	-.30***	-.06	.01
13. Fellowship awards to students	.04	.19**	.08	.10	.01
14. Placement of graduates	-.12	.03	-.11	-.04	.07
15. Research quality	.29***	.28***	.24***	.42***	.12

***Significant at less than .001. **Significant at less than .01. *Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 deans.

Table 107. Relationships Between Teaching Variables and Formal Rewards[a]

	Faculty Teaching Load			Proportion of Faculty Time Spent Teaching		
Formal Rewards	Deans	Chairs	Faculty	Deans	Chairs	Faculty
Tenure Weights						
Teaching	.46***	.42***	.38***	.43***	.46***	.36***
Research	-.16*	-.30***	-.30***	-.23**	-.28***	-.28***
Publications	-.36***	-.28***	-.32***	-.38***	-.38***	-.33***
Institutional service	.29***	.22***	.22***	.33***	.24***	.22***
Professional organizations	.01	-.02	-.04	.04	.00	-.04
Community service	.11	.07	.19***	.15*	.11*	.18***
Merit Salary Awards						
Teaching	-.24**	-.03	-.03	-.25**	-.16***	-.03
Research	-.31***	-.12**	-.25***	-.27***	-.29***	-.26***
Public Service	.02	.04	.01	.13	.02	.02

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

Correlations are tau b. N = 142 Deans, 392 Chairs, 1,172 Faculty.

Table 108. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Deans' Sample

	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)	
Faculty Teaching Load	Second Weight or Lower	Highest Weight
10 Credits or Less	71	20
11 Credits or More	29	80
N	(31)	(103)

Tau b = .46, significant at less than .001.

Table 109. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)[a]		
Faculty Teaching Load	Third Weight or Lower	Second Weight	Highest Weight
7 Credits or Less	39	16	3
8-10 Credits	31	50	17
11-13 Credits	28	32	67
14 Credits or More	3	3	13
N	(51)	(38)	(281)

Tau b = .42, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 110. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)[a]			
Faculty Teaching Load	4th Weight or Lower	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
None	4	3	1	2
7 Credit Hours or Less	26	37	27	3
8-10 Credit Hours	26	34	36	21
11-13 Credit Hours	38	21	30	59
14 Credit Hours or More	7	5	6	16
N	(74)	(294)	(168)	(607)

Tau b = .38, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 111. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Deans' Sample

	Tenure Weight for Publishing (%)			
Faculty Teaching Load	4th Weight or Lower	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
10 Credits or Less	12	24	36	68
11 Credits or More	88	76	64	32
N	(40)	(37)	(31)	(25)

Tau b = -.36, significant at less than .001.

Table 112. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Chairs' Sample

	Tenure Weight for Publishing (%)					
Faculty Teaching Load	Lowest Weight	Fifth Weight	Fourth Weight	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
7 or fewer credits	0	5	2	6	10	25
8-10 credits	9	18	11	20	22	39
11-13 credits	70	67	71	65	58	33
14 or more credits	22	10	16	10	10	3
N	(23)	(39)	(56)	(71)	(99)	(64)

Tau b = -.28, significant at less than .001.

Table 113. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Faculty Sample

Faculty Teaching Load	Tenure Weight for Publishing (%)[a] Lowest Weight	Fifth Weight	Fourth Weight	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
None	0	4	2	1	2	2
7 credits or less	3	1	3	7	18	30
8-10 credits	18	20	16	28	22	35
11-13 credits	56	51	60	53	48	27
14 credits or more	23	24	19	12	10	5
N	(62)	(82)	(103)	(173)	(306)	(395)

Tau b = -.32, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 114. Faculty Teaching Load by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

	Tenure Weight for Research (%)					
Faculty Teaching Load	Lowest Weight	Fifth Weight	Fourth Weight[a]	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
None	2	0	2	2	2	3
7 credits or less	7	3	3	8	19	41
8-10 credits	16	15	24	24	32	29
11-13 credits	53	65	52	54	39	22
14 credits or more	22	17	18	12	8	5
N	(45)	(72)	(120)	(267)	(437)	(182)

Tau b = -.30, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 115. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Deans' Sample

	Merit Salary Awards for Teaching (%)	
Faculty Teaching Load	No	Yes
10 Credits or Less	12	38
11 Credits or More	88	62
N	(34)	(103)

Tau b = -.24, significant at less than .01.

Table 116. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

	Merit Salary Awards for Teaching (%)	
Faculty Teaching Load	No	Yes
7 Credits or Less	8	10
8-10 Credits	22	23
11-13 Credits	59	57
14 Credits or More	11	10
N	(124)	(247)

Tau b = -.03, not significant.

Table 117. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Merit Salary Awards for Teaching (%)	
Faculty Teaching Load	No	Yes
None	1	3
7 Credits or Less	16	18
8-10 Credits	28	25
11-13 Credits	43	44
14 Credits or More	12	10
N	(570)	(553)

Tau b = -.03, not significant.

Table 118. Faculty Teaching Load by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

	Merit Salary Awards for Research (%)	
Faculty Teaching Load	No	Yes[a]
None	1	2
7 Credits or Less	5	23
8-10 Credits	23	29
11-13 Credits	55	37
14 Credits or More	16	8
N	(397)	(727)

Tau b = -.25, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 119. Resource Adequacy by Deans' Department Assessment Standards, Faculty Sample[a]

	DEANS' DEPARTMENT ASSESSMENT STANDARDS														
Resource Adequacy	Grants Obtained	Publications	Papers Delivered	Conferences Organized	Enrollment	Teaching Quality	Internal Reputation	External Reputation	Student Quality	Attrition	Course Quality	Time for Leave	Fellowship Awards to Students	Placement of Graduates	Research Quality
Faculty salary	.11***	.12***	.09***	.05*	-.07**	.03	.02	.12***	.05*	-.08	.03	.03	.08**	.04	.16***
Travel to conferences	-.03	.00	.05*	.06**	-.07**	.19***	.08***	.05*	.09***	-.09***	.05*	.00	.03	.06*	.05*
Travel to develop grants	.12***	.12***	.16***	.15***	-.09***	.09***	.07**	.13***	.08**	-.06*	.04	.09**	.14***	.09***	.15***
Research by senior professors	.08***	.13***	.13***	.09***	-.10***	.07**	.08***	.13***	.13***	-.09***	.08**	.05*	.16***	.11***	.20***
Research by untenured professors	.20***	.22***	.15***	.08**	-.14***	-.01	.03	.16***	.07**	-.14***	-.02	-.03	.12***	.02	.27***
Purchase of computer equipment	-.03	-.07**	-.03	.01	-.05*	.12***	.06*	.04	.12***	-.05*	.08**	.04	.09***	.09***	.01
Purchase of research equipment	.07**	.07**	.08**	.06**	-.08**	.11***	.07**	.13***	.14***	-.06*	.06*	.05	.16***	.11***	.14***
Purchase of library books	-.03	.01	.02	.01	-.01	.15***	.10***	.08***	.14***	-.01	.12***	.04	.07**	.12***	.04
Purchase of library journals	.04*	.08**	.05**	.06*	-.06*	.09***	.07**	.10***	.13***	-.03	.07**	.04	.13***	.10***	.10***
Personnel for grant development	.10***	.08***	.08**	.11***	-.03	.05*	.03	.11***	.07**	-.02	.03	.05*	.13***	.09***	.15***
Offering courses frequently enough	.02	.00	.00	-.02	-.03	.17***	.10***	.01	.12***	.02	.10***	.04	.05*	.07**	.02
Student research assistants	.10***	.10***	.08**	.06*	-.08**	.11***	.07*	.15***	.14***	-.02	.06*	.05*	.16***	.08**	.13***
Student teaching assistants	.17***	.16***	.09***	.03	-.08*	.02	.05*	.17***	.06*	-.08**	.00	.00	.12***	.07**	.17***
Sabbaticals to improve teaching	-.09***	-.13***	-.06*	.00	.00	.22***	.06*	.01	.16***	.02	.12***	.07*	.06**	.14***	-.04
Sabbaticals to do publishable research	.06**	.05*	.05*	.04	-.05*	.08***	.01	.13***	.09***	-.05*	.02	.01	.10***	.10***	.13***

***Significant at less than .001. **Significant at less than .01. *Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 1,172 faculty.

Table 120. Adequacy of Resources for Grants Travel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Grants, Faculty Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Grants Travel	Deans' Assessment--Grants (%)			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important[a]
Poor	76	57	54	54
Fair	16	29	29	28
Good, Excellent	8	14	17	19
N	(179)	(270)	(273)	(303)

Tau b = .12, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 121. Adequacy of Resources for Grants Development Personnel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Grants, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Grants (%)			
Adequacy of Resources for Grants Development	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important[a]
Poor	54	40	35	36
Fair	31	36	38	38
Good, Excellent	15	24	28	25
N	(186)	(276)	(283)	(307)

Tau b = .10, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 122. Adequacy of Resources for Travel to Develop Grants by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Deans' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Extramural Grants (%)			
Adequacy of Resources for Grant Travel	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	52	53	23	29
Fair	24	38	43	53
Good, Excellent	24	9	34	18
N	(21)	(53)	(47)	(17)

Tau b = .20, significant at less than .001.

Table 123. Adequacy of Resources for Travel to Develop Grants by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Chairs' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Grant Development Travel	Deans' Assessment--Extramural Grants (%) Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	70	60	46	43
Fair	20	25	24	35
Good, Excellent	10	15	30	22
N	(95)	(138)	(89)	(51)

Tau b = .18, significant at less than .001.

Table 124. Adequacy of Resources for Grant Development Personnel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Deans' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Extramural Grants (%)			
Adequacy of Resources for Grant Develop. Personnel	Not Important	Somewhat Important[a]	Important	Very Important
Poor	57	36	21	18
Fair	38	42	47	29
Good, Excellent	5	23	32	53
N	(21)	(53)	(47)	(17)

Tau b = .29, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 125. Adequacy of Resources for Grant Development Personnel by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Extramural Grants, Chairs' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Extramural Grants (%)[a]			
Adequacy of Resources for Grant Develop. Personnel	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	50	46	34	31
Fair	38	37	32	39
Good, Excellent	13	16	35	29
N	(95)	(139)	(89)	(51)

Tau b = .16, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 126. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)		
	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	50	26	14
Fair	32	45	49
Good, Excellent	18	29	37
N	(22)	(69)	(49)

Tau b = .21, significant at less than .01.

Table 127. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important[a]	Important	Very Important
Poor	88	58	36	32
Fair	6	34	40	47
Good, Excellent	6	9	24	21
N	(33)	(92)	(156)	(94)

Tau b = .25, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 128. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	75	50	35	37
Fair	19	42	42	31
Good	6	7	20	24
Excellent	0	1	3	8
N	(69)	(275)	(408)	(335)

Tau b = .20, significant at less than .001.

Table 129. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)		
	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	57	28	2
Fair	29	42	48
Good, Excellent	14	30	50
N	(21)	(69)	(48)

Tau b = .36, significant at less than .001.

Table 130. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	91	60	39	20
Fair	6	33	31	36
Good, Excellent	3	7	30	44
N	(33)	(90)	(156)	(94)

Tau b = .37, significant at less than .001.

Table 131. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)[a]			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	78	49	32	27
Fair	16	41	41	30
Good	4	9	22	34
Excellent	1	2	5	9
N	(69)	(277)	(407)	(334)

Tau b = .27, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 132. Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment	Deans' Assessment--Research (%) Not, Somewhat Important[a]	Important	Very Important
Poor	41	29	17
Fair	46	45	48
Good, Excellent	14	26	35
N	(22)	(69)	(48)

Tau b = .19, significant at less than .01.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 133. Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)[a]			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	59	46	34	46
Fair	34	46	47	26
Good, Excellent	6	9	19	29
N	(32)	(88)	(145)	(90)

Tau b = .12, significant at less than .01.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 134. Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research Equipment	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)			
	Not Important[a]	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	63	46	36	34
Fair	29	40	41	41
Good, Excellent	9	14	23	25
N	(70)	(269)	(388)	(316)

Tau b = .14, significant at less than .01.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 135. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%) Somewhat Important, Important	Very Important
Poor, Fair	44	8
Good	40	71
Excellent	16	21
N	(25)	(114)

Tau b = .25, significant at less than .01.

Table 136. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)[a]		
Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor, Fair	20	32	18
Good	77	56	61
Excellent	3	13	20
N	(30)	(142)	(207)

Tau b = .14, significant at less than .01.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 137. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

Adequacy of Resources Equipment for Offering Courses	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	66	42	31	22
Fair	23	30	34	31
Good	10	26	29	33
Excellent	1	2	6	14
N	(74)	(236)	(400)	(386)

Tau b = .22, significant at less than .001.

Table 138. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)	
Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals	Somewhat Important, Important	Very Important
Poor	24	22
Fair	20	20
Good	40	34
Excellent	16	24
N	(25)	(114)

Tau b = .04, not significant.

Table 139. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)[a] Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	28	26	27
Fair	14	33	27
Good	38	35	33
Excellent	21	7	13
N	(29)	(141)	(204)

Tau b = .00, not significant.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 140. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)			
Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Poor	66	42	31	22
Fair	23	30	34	31
Good	10	26	29	33
Excellent	1	2	6	14
N	(74)	(236)	(400)	(386)

Tau b = .22, significant at less than .001.

Table 141. Factor Analysis of Deans' Department Assessment Standards and Adequacy of Resources, Faculty Sample

Variables	FACTORS 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Resource Adequacy:								
Conference Travel	-.054	.638	-.160	.204	.153	.123	.240	.082
Grant Travel	.159	.718	.031	.115	.140	.017	-.011	.025
Research, Senior Professors	.162	.695	.086	-.087	.096	.231	.096	-.088
Research, Untenured Professors	.273	.618	.000	-.093	.154	.361	.057	-.165
Computers	-.150	.645	.100	.245	-.037	.010	.054	-.069
Research Equipment	.031	.706	.132	.225	.034	.156	-.062	-.074
Library Books	-.005	.247	.061	.855	.110	.074	.098	-.017
Library Journals	.096	.227	.109	.864	.039	.102	-.012	-.074
Grant Personnel	.150	.349	.201	.100	.285	-.131	-.142	-.075
Courses	-.016	.058	-.012	.415	.141	.420	.196	.101
Student RA's	.080	.336	.119	.105	.075	.728	.010	.023
Student TA's	.135	.150	.055	.092	.137	.792	-.002	-.072
Sabbaticals - Teaching	-.109	.158	.047	.102	.868	.117	.116	.074
Sabbaticals - Research	.093	.193	.041	.073	.856	.197	-.009	-.047
Dean's Standards:								
Extramural Grants	.731	-.015	.010	.004	.007	.188	-.216	-.166
Publications	.873	.028	-.124	.013	-.029	.093	-.061	-.121
Papers	.816	.111	-.030	.044	-.031	-.019	-.046	.269
Conferences	.667	.161	.087	.024	-.054	-.140	-.017	.400
Enrollment	-.088	-.102	.119	-.045	.039	-.050	.205	.696
Teaching Quality	-.284	.118	.206	.104	.142	.006	.641	.210
Institutional Reputation	.123	.033	.199	.039	-.037	.029	.773	.011
National Reputation	.603	.028	.210	.022	.083	.122	.254	-.305
Student Quality	.019	.108	.559	.066	.058	.119	.489	.116
Attrition	-.120	-.193	.440	-.016	-.018	.094	.010	.621
Courses	-.193	.041	.594	.097	-.020	.023	.333	.206
Degree Time	-.031	.026	.656	.015	-.083	.039	.046	.235
Fellowships	.269	.138	.746	.031	.044	.069	-.031	-.086
Placement	.000	.047	.721	.046	.184	-.013	.189	-.004
Research	.765	.105	.047	.000	.079	.056	.098	-.253

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance Explained Each Factor	Cumulative
1	5.617	19.4	19.4
2	3.931	13.6	32.9
3	2.813	9.7	42.6
4	1.458	5.0	47.7
5	1.327	4.6	52.2
6	1.177	4.1	56.3
7	1.106	3.8	60.1
8	1.079	3.7	63.8

Table 142. Relationships Between Teaching Variables and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

Deans' Department Assessment Factors	Faculty Teaching Load			Proportion of Faculty Time Spent Teaching		
	Deans	Chairs	Faculty	Deans	Chairs	Faculty
1. Grants obtained	-.26***	-.25***	-.32***	-.30***	-.25***	-.29***
2. Publications	-.40***	-.34***	-.32***	-.36***	-.33***	-.34***
3. Papers delivered	-.10	-.16***	-.10***	-.14*	-.11*	.12***
4. Conferences organized	.08	-.03	-.02	.12	.02	-.03
5. Enrollment	.02	.11**	.09***	.04	.17***	.07**
6. Teaching quality	.08	.17***	.16***	.19**	.14**	.14***
7. Internal reputation	.06	.02	.01	.10	.03	.03
8. External reputation	-.08	-.24***	-.25***	-.22**	-.26***	-.25***
9. Student quality	.04	.05	.01	.02	.04	.04
10. Attrition	.10	.17***	.12***	.17*	.22***	.13***
11. Course quality	.13*	.10*	.12***	.03	.13**	.13***
12. Time for degree	.13	.07	.11***	.10	.04	.09***
13. Fellowship awards to students	.04	-.17***	-.10***	-.09	-.11*	-.09***
14. Placement of graduates	.14*	.01	.03	.02	.08*	.06
15. Research quality	-.28***	-.27***	-.30***	-.33***	-.33***	-.30***

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

Correlations are tau b. N = 142 Deans, 392 Chairs, 1,172 Faculty.

Table 143. Faculty Teaching Load by Deans' Department Assessment Standard--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)[a]		
Faculty Teaching Load	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
7 Credits or Less	23	12	4
8-10 Credits	17	27	20
11-13 Credits	57	52	62
14 Credits or More	3	8	13
N	(30)	(139)	(202)

Tau b = .17, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 144. Faculty Teaching Load by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)			
Faculty Teaching Load	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important[a]
None	0	4	1	3
7 Credits or Less	30	24	17	9
8-10 Credits	26	29	28	22
11-13 Credits	34	37	42	52
14 Credits or More	10	6	12	13
N	(80)	(245)	(411)	(398)

Tau b = .16, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 145. Relationships Between Selected Tenure Weights and Deans' Department Assessment Factors

Deans' Department Assessment Factors	Tenure Weights					
	Teaching			Publishing		
	Deans	Chairs	Faculty	Deans	Chairs	Faculty
1. Grants obtained	-.34***	-.38***	-.46***	.34***	.42***	.40***
2. Publications	-.46***	-.44***	-.53***	.50***	.56***	.58***
3. Papers delivered	-.26**	-.18***	-.27***	.32***	.34***	.30***
4. Conferences organized	.09	-.01	-.12***	-.07	.20***	.14***
5. Enrollment	.04	-.08	.16***	.00	-.12**	.14***
6. Teaching quality	.19*	.31***	.48***	-.22**	-.15***	-.33***
7. Internal reputation	.17*	.04	.07**	-.19**	.06	-.09***
8. External reputation	-.20**	-.30***	-.34***	.14*	.30***	.30***
9. Student quality	-.01	.07	.19***	-.07	-.07	-.17***
10. Attrition	.15*	.15***	.20***	-.20**	-.19***	-.21***
11. Course quality	.06	.17***	.23***	.00	-.19***	-.23***
12. Time for degree	.13	.06	.10***	-.18**	-.09*	-.12***
13. Fellowship awards to students	.00	-.12**	-.06*	-.10	.08	.05*
14. Placement of graduates	.13	.03	.13***	-.09	-.07	-.16***
15. Research quality	-.37***	-.36***	-.43***	.42***	.45***	.43***

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

Correlations are tau b. N = 142 Deans, 392 Chairs, 1,172 Faculty.

Table 146. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)	
Tenure Weight for Teaching	Somewhat Important, Important	Very Important
Second Weight or Lower	40	20
Highest Weight	60	80
N	(25)	(112)

Tau b = .19, significant at less than .05.

Table 147. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)		
Tenure Weight for Teaching	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important[a]
Third Weight or Lower	38	21	4
Second Weight	10	15	7
Highest Weight	52	64	88
N	(29)	(143)	(204)

Tau b = .31, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 148. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)			
Tenure Weight for Teaching	Not Important[a]	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Fourth Weight or Lower	42	14	2	0
Third Weight	38	44	29	8
Second Weight	11	18	19	9
Highest Weight	8	24	50	83
N	(71)	(243)	(404)	(392)

Tau b = .48, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 149. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Deans' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Course Quality (%)		
Tenure Weight for Teaching	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Second Weight or Lower	27	18	26
Highest Weight	73	82	74
N	(62)	(55)	(19)

Tau b = .06, not significant.

Table 150. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Chairs' Sample

	Dean's Assessment--Course Quality (%)[a]			
Tenure Weight for Teaching	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Third Weight or Lower	23	17	9	3
Second Weight	14	12	7	10
Highest Weight	64	72	83	86
N	(52)	(137)	(151)	(29)

Tau b = .17, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 151. Tenure Weight for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Course Quality (%)			
Tenure Weight for Teaching	Not Important[a]	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Fourth Weight or Lower	15	5	4	0
Third Weight	32	29	16	14
Second Weight	15	16	13	9
Highest Weight	37	50	67	77
N	(230)	(504)	(309)	(56)

Tau b = .23, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 152. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Deans' Sample

Tenure Weight for Publishing	Deans' Assessment--Publishing (%)		
	Not, Somewhat Important	Important[a]	Very Important
Fourth Weight or Lower	58	14	4
Third Weight	21	41	21
Second Weight	19	28	21
Highest Weight	2	18	54
N	(57)	(51)	(28)

Tau b = .50, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 153. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Chairs' Sample

Tenure Weight for Publishing	Deans' Assessment--Publishing (%)[a]			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Lowest Weight	20	8	0	2
Fifth Weight	33	17	0	2
Fourth Weight	24	24	12	0
Third Weight	14	24	24	9
Second Weight	9	21	43	31
Highest Weight	0	5	22	57
N	(55)	(131)	(102)	(67)

Tau b = .56, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 154. Tenure Weight for Publishing by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Publishing, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Publishing (%)[a]			
Tenure Weight for Publishing	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Lowest Weight	28	8	2	0
Fifth Weight	26	16	3	0
Fourth Weight	24	21	4	1
Third Weight	9	26	21	5
Second Weight	11	23	38	27
Highest Weight	3	7	33	66
N	(110)	(277)	(322)	(383)

Tau b = .58, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 155. Tenure Weight for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

Tenure Weight for Research	Deans' Assessment--Research (%) Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important[a]
Fourth Weight or Lower	50	15	6
Third Weight	10	31	23
First or Second Weight	40	54	70
N	(20)	(67)	(47)

Tau b = .25, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 156. Tenure Weight for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)			
Tenure Weight for Research	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Fifth, Sixth Weight	55	14	4	2
Fourth Weight	13	20	5	3
Third Weight	16	31	28	18
Second Weight	16	29	57	38
Highest Weight	0	6	6	39
N	(31)	(90)	(153)	(90)

Tau b = .44, significant at less than .001.

Table 157. Tenure Weight for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)[a]			
Tenure Weight for Research	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Lowest Weight	26	6	2	0
Fifth Weight	31	13	3	0
Fourth Weight	10	21	11	4
Third Weight	17	28	30	14
Second Weight	11	28	39	53
Highest Weight	6	4	16	30
N	(72)	(272)	(404)	(339)

Tau b = .43, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 158. Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--National Reputation, Deans' Sample

Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations	Deans' Assessment--National Reputation (%)		
	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Lowest Weight	28	23	15
Fifth Weight	37	29	46
Fourth and Higher Weights	35	48	39
N	(51)	(48)	(33)

Tau b = .08, not significant.

Table 159. Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--National Reputation, Chairs' Sample

Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations	Deans' Assessment--National Reputation (%)			
	Not Important[a]	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Lowest Weight	14	25	17	7
Fifth Weight	48	33	45	33
Fourth Weight	21	24	26	38
Third Weight or Higher	16	18	12	22
N	(85)	(120)	(106)	(45)

Tau b = .06, not significant.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 160. Tenure Weight for Professional Organisational Service by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--National Presentation, Faculty Sample

Tenure Weight for Professional Organizational Service	Deans' Assessment--National Presentation (%)			
	Not Important[a]	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Fourth Weight or Lower	15	5	4	0
Third Weight	32	29	16	14
Second Weight	15	16	13	9
Highest Weight	37	50	67	77
N	(230)	(504)	(309)	(56)

Tau b = .23, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 161. Tenure Weight for Service to the Institution by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Internal Reputation, Deans' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Institutional Reputation (%)		
Tenure Weight for Service to Institution	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Fifth, Sixth Weight	31	16	12
Fourth Weight	37	27	37
Third Weight	26	30	23
First, Second Weight	6	27	28
N	(35)	(56)	(43)

Tau b = .18, significant at less than .01.

Table 162. Tenure Weight for Service to the Institution by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Internal Reputation, Chairs' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Institutional Reputation (%)[a]		
Tenure Weight for Service to Institution	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Fifth, Sixth Weight	17	16	17
Fourth Weight	35	30	30
Third Weight	17	28	22
Second, First Weight	31	27	30
N	(75)	(193)	(99)

Tau b = .01, not significant.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 163. Tenure Weight for Service to the Institution by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Internal Reputation, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Internal Reputation (%)			
Tenure Weight for Service to Institution	Not Important[a]	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Lowest Weight	27	19	17	23
Fifth Weight	30	41	47	37
Fourth Weight	27	24	22	26
Third Weight	12	13	12	9
Second, First Weight	3	3	2	5
N	(59)	(252)	(500)	(236)

Tau b = -.01, not significant.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 164. Relationships Between Selected Merit Salary Variables and Deans' Department Assessment Factors[a]

	Merit Salary Variables					
	Teaching			Research		
Deans' Department Assessment Factors	Deans	Chairs	Faculty	Deans	Chairs	Faculty
1. Grants obtained	.17*	.09*	-.02	.18*	.30***	.32***
2. Publications	.18*	.13**	.03	.24**	.36***	.45***
3. Papers delivered	.04	.14**	.08**	.11	.25***	.35***
4. Conferences organized	-.04	.14**	.10***	-.01	.18***	.21***
5. Enrollment	-.10	-.20***	.01	-.10	-.22***	-.18***
6. Teaching quality	-.05	.09*	.25***	-.13	.00	-.12***
7. Internal reputation	-.10	.01	.10***	-.10	.00	.03
8. External reputation	.15*	.12**	.01	.14*	.21***	.25***
9. Student quality	.14*	.03	.17***	.08	.00	-.01
10. Attrition	-.02	-.14**	.03	-.05	-.18***	-.17***
11. Course quality	.03	.00	.08**	.01	-.14**	-.13***
12. Time for degree	.00	-.01	.03	-.09	-.07	-.08**
13. Fellowship awards to students	.07	.03	.05	.05	.05	.11***
14. Placement of graduates	.13	-.01	.05*	.06	-.03	-.06*
15. Research quality	.14*	.18***	.06*	.29***	.42***	.44***

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 Deans, 392 Chairs, 1,172 Faculty.

Table 165. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Deans' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)	
Merit Salary Awards for Teaching	Somewhat Important, Important	Very Important
No	20	26
Yes	80	74
N	(25)	(115)

Tau b = -.05, not significant.

Table 166. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Chairs' Sample

Merit Salary Awards for Teaching	Dean's' Assessment--Teaching (%) Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
No	57	33	31
Yes	43	67	69
N	(30)	(143)	(203)

Tau b = .09, significant at less than .05.

Table 167. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Teaching (%)			
Merit Salary Awards for Teaching	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
No	88	66	47	37
Yes	12	34	53	63
N	(80)	(232)	(392)	(389)

Tau b = .25, significant at less than .001.

Table 168. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Deans' Sample

Merit Salary Awards for Teaching	Deans' Assessment--Course Quality (%)		
	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
No	27	22	26
Yes	73	78	74
N	(62)	(58)	(19)

Tau b = .03, not significant.

Table 169. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Chairs' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Course Quality (%)			
Merit Salary Awards for Teaching	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
No	31	35	34	31
Yes	69	65	66	69
N	(52)	(134)	(151)	(32)

Tau b = .00, not significant.

Table 170. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Course Quality, Faculty Sample

Merit Salary Awards for Teaching	Deans' Assessment--Course Quality (%)			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
No	58	50	48	41
Yes	42	50	52	59
N	(233)	(493)	(300)	(54)

Tau b = .08, significant at less than .01.

Table 171. Merit Salary Awards for Teaching by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Student Attrition, Chairs' Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Student Attrition (%)			
Merit Salary Awards for Teaching	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
No	26	25	44	40
Yes	74	75	56	60
N	(49)	(140)	(220)	(67)

Tau b = -.14, significant at less than .01.

Table 172. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Deans' Sample

Merit Salary Awards for Research	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)		
	Not, Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
No	50	29	10
Yes	50	71	90
N	(22)	(66)	(49)

Tau b = .29, significant at less than .001.

Table 173. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Chairs' Sample

Merit Salary Awards for Research	Deans' Assessment--Research (%) Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
No	88	51	30	8
Yes	12	49	70	92
N	(34)	(87)	(154)	(94)

Tau b = .42, significant at less than .001.

Table 174. Merit Salary Awards for Research by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

Merit Salary Awards for Research	Deans' Assessment--Research (%) Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
No	94	59	28	12
Yes	6	41	72	88
N	(68)	(276)	(406)	(337)

Tau b = .44, significant at less than .001.

Table 175. Relationships Between Formal Rewards for Teaching and Resource Adequacy[a]

	Formal Rewards for Teaching					
	Tenure Weight			Merit Raise		
Resource Adequacy	Deans	Chairs	Faculty	Deans	Chairs	Faculty
Travel to conferences	.16*	.01	.12***	-.01	.16***	.12***
Travel to develop grants	.03	-.03	.03	.05	.08	.09**
Research by senior professors	-.06	-.10*	-.06*	.05	.14**	.11***
Research by untenured professors	-.17*	-.24***	-.16***	.11	.15***	.14***
Purchase of computer equipment	.03	-.09*	.09***	.04	.16***	.11***
Purchase of research equipment	-.09	-.08	.01	.16*	.16***	.06*
Purchase of library books	.21**	.01	.08**	-.11	.07	.05*
Purchase of library journals	.15*	-.05	-.03	-.07	.06	.06*
Personnel for grant development	-.02	-.15**	-.03	.00	.11*	.08**
Offering courses frequently enough	.02	-.04	.06**	-.06	.02	.11***
Student research assistants	-.06	-.13**	-.06*	.08	.07	.10***
Student teaching assistants	-.19*	-.17***	-.13***	.09	.06	.07**
Sabbaticals to improve teaching	.15*	.07	.16***	.05	-.01	.11***
Sabbaticals to do publishable research	-.04	-.13**	-.03	.14*	.05	.06*

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 142 Deans, 392 Chairs, 1,172 Faculty.

Table 176. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Deans' Sample

	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)	
Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses	Second Weight or Lower	Highest Weight
Poor, Fair	19	14
Good	58	67
Excellent	23	19
N	(31)	(103)

Tau b = .02, not significant.

Table 177. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)		
Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses	Third Weight or Lower	Second Weight[a]	Highest Weight
Poor, Fair	16	23	24
Good	70	56	60
Excellent	14	20	16
N	(50)	(39)	(289)

Tau b = -.04, not significant.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 178. Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)			
Adequacy of Resources for Offering Courses	4th Weight or Lower	Third Weight[a]	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Poor	14	7	9	6
Fair	33	24	22	25
Good	46	57	59	54
Excellent	7	11	10	15
N	(72)	(282)	(165)	(590)

Tau b = .06, significant at less than .01.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 179. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Deans' Sample

	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)[a]	
Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals	Second Weight or Lower	Highest Weight
Poor	32	19
Fair	29	17
Good	19	40
Excellent	19	23
N	(31)	(104)

Tau b = .15, significant at less than .05.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 180. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Chairs' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%) Third Weight or Lower	Second Weight	Highest Weight[a]
Poor	40	17	25
Fair	28	37	27
Good	22	29	38
Excellent	10	17	11
N	(50)	(35)	(289)

Tau b = .07, not significant.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 181. Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Teaching Sabbaticals	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%)[a]			
	4th Weight or Lower	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Poor	61	36	35	26
Fair	19	35	30	32
Good	15	25	26	32
Excellent	4	4	8	10
N	(72)	(276)	(159)	(596)

Tau b = .16, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 182. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Deans' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors	Tenure Weight for Publishing (%)			
	4th Weight or Lower	Third Weight[a]	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Poor	38	15	23	0
Fair	42	38	30	64
Good, Excellent	20	46	47	36
N	(40)	(39)	(30)	(25)

Tau b = .20, significant at less than .01.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 183. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Chairs' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors	Tenure Weight for Publishing (%)					
	Lowest Weight	Fifth Weight	Fourth Weight	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Poor	87	75	50	46	32	23
Fair	9	20	34	28	32	30
Good, Excellent	4	5	16	26	36	47
N	(23)	(40)	(56)	(74)	(100)	(66)

Tau b = .33, significant at less than .001.

Table 184. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors, by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

	Tenure Weight for Research (%)					
Adequacy of Resources for Research by Untenured Professors	Lowest Weight	Fifth Weight	Fourth Weight	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Poor	70	64	48	41	31	27
Fair	26	26	38	38	35	36
Good	2	10	13	17	29	27
Excellent	2	0	1	4	5	10
N	(43)	(70)	(118)	(258)	(419)	(177)

Tau b = .22, significant at less than .001.

Table 185. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Deans' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors	Merit Salary Awards for Research (%)	
	No	Yes
Poor	34	21
Fair	46	43
Good, Excellent	20	36
N	(35)	(104)

Tau b = .16, significant at less than .05.

Table 186. Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Chairs' Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors	Merit Salary Awards for Research (%)	
	No	Yes[a]
Poor	59	37
Fair	27	44
Good, Excellent	14	20
N	(130)	(246)

Tau b = .18, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 187 Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors by Merit Salary Awards for Research, Faculty Sample

Adequacy of Resources for Research by Senior Professors	Merit Salary Awards for Research (%)[a]	
	No	Yes
Poor	52	36
Fair	34	38
Good	11	21
Excellent	3	4
N	(381)	(708)

Tau b = .16, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 188. Adequacy of Full Professors' Salaries by Tenure Weight for Publishing, Deans' Sample

Adequacy of Full Professors' Salaries	Tenure Weight for Publishing (%)[a] 4th Weight or Lower	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Poor	40	26	16	16
Average	45	37	39	36
Good	8	26	26	32
Very Good	8	10	19	16
N	(40)	(38)	(31)	(25)

Tau b = .24, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 189. Relationships Between Professional Development Variables, Selected Formal Rewards, and Selected Deans' Departmental Assessment Factors[a]

	Professional Development Variables (1984-85)		
	Out-of-State Professional Meetings	% of Meeting Costs Reimbursed	Total $ for Professional Development
Tenure Weights			
Teaching	-.11***	.14***	.00
Research	.11***	-.07**	.09***
Publications	.10***	-.08**	.03
Professional Organization Svc.	.03	-.01	.00
Merit Salary Awards			
Teaching	.08**	.09**	.08**
Research	.17***	.04	.08**
Deans' Dept. Assessment Factors			
Grants	.11***	-.05*	.07**
Publications	.15***	-.05*	.07**
Papers	.07**	.00	.03
Teaching	-.03	.13***	.04
National Reputation	.13***	-.04	.06*
Research	.13***	.02	.10***

***Significant at less than .001.
**Significant at less than .01.
*Significant at less than .05.

[a] Correlations are tau b. N = 1,172 faculty.

Table 190. Number of Out-of-State Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty, by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Papers Given at Professional Meetings, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Papers (%)			
Number of Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
None	25	27	21	24
1	42	32	29	31
2	20	21	26	19
3	6	12	15	14
4 or More	7	8	9	12
N	(96)	(434)	(463)	(140)

Tau b = .07, significant at less than .01.

Table 191. Proportion of Meeting Attendance Costs Reimbursed by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Papers Given at Professional Meetings, Faculty Sample

	Deans' Assessment--Papers (%)			
Proportion of Meeting Attendance Costs Reimbursed	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Zero	30	18	19	30
1-25%	14	11	13	12
26-50%	19	16	15	11
51-75%	8	16	13	12
76-90%	6	16	15	14
91-100%	23	23	25	21
N	(84)	(348)	(391)	(119)

Tau b = .00, not significant.

Table 192. Total Professional Development Support by Deans' Department Assessment Standards--Research, Faculty Sample

Total Professional Development Support	Deans' Assessment--Research (%)[a]			
	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
Zero	22	14	10	15
\$1-\$250	24	22	19	15
\$251-\$500	22	24	22	15
\$501-\$1,000	13	17	17	20
\$1,001-\$2,000	10	12	13	11
More than \$2,000	9	12	19	23
N	(68)	(281)	(396)	(332)

Tau b = .10, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 193. Total Professional Development Support by Tenure Weight for Teaching, Faculty Sample

Total Professional Development Support	Tenure Weight for Teaching (%) 4th Weight or Lower	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Zero	12	15	15	27
$1-$250	20	16	15	25
$251-$500	23	23	15	18
$501-$1,000	17	16	19	16
$1,001-$2,000	13	7	14	4
More than $2,000	15	23	22	10
N	(582)	(159)	(276)	(73)

Tau b = .00, not significant.

Table 194. Total Professional Development Support by Tenure Weight for Research, Faculty Sample

Total Professional Development Support	Tenure Weight for Research (%)[a] Lowest Weight	Fifth Weight	Fourth Weight	Third Weight	Second Weight	Highest Weight
Zero	17	16	20	11	11	20
$1-$250	27	23	24	20	16	12
$251-$500	20	23	22	26	20	15
$501-$1,000	10	21	4	18	20	18
$1,001-$2,000	15	7	16	8	14	11
More than $2,000	12	10	13	17	19	24
N	(41)	(70)	(116)	(259)	(415)	(169)

Tau b = .09, significant at less than .001.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 195. Number of Out-of-State Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty, by Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations, Faculty Sample

Number of Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty	Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations (%)[a] Lowest Weight	Fifth Weight	Fourth Weight	Third Weight	First, Second Weight
Zero	27	23	24	23	50
1	35	32	29	37	6
2	22	22	25	17	12
3	11	14	12	14	25
4 or More	4	9	10	10	6
N	(209)	(469)	(254)	(124)	(32)

Tau b = .03, not significant.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 196. Proportion of Meeting Attendance Costs Reimbursed by Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations, Faculty Sample

	Tenure Weight for Service to Professional Organizations (%)[a]				
Proportion of Professional Meetings Attended by Faculty	Lowest Weight	Fifth Weight	Fourth Weight	Third Weight	First, Second Weight
Zero	19	20	20	23	21
1-25%	13	12	11	12	21
26-50%	16	15	17	14	10
51-75%	14	13	17	11	10
76-90%	18	14	13	15	10
91% or More	20	26	22	24	26
N	(172)	(391)	(208)	(105)	(19)

Tau b = -.01, not significant.

[a] Percentages do not sum 100 due to rounding.

Table 197. Regression of Professors' Salary on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Graduate Students	.006	.036	NS
FTE Faculty - Unit	.184	2.033	<.05
FTE Faculty - Institution	.142	.985	NS
Highest Degree Offered	-.027	-.194	NS
Total Students	.018	.115	NS
(Constant)		7.190	<.001

$r_m = .28$

Table 198. Regression of Teaching Load on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Graduate Students	.285	1.728	<.10
FTE Faculty - Unit	-.066	-.790	NS
FTE Faculty - Institution	-.314	-2.341	<.05
Highest Degree Offered	-.507	-3.922	<.001
Total Students	.103	.730	NS
(Constant)		22.328	<.001

$r_m = .47$

Table 199. Regression of Percentage of Time Teaching on Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	-.119	-1.109	NS
Institutional Reputation	.102	1.192	NS
Attrition	.152	1.762	<.10
Conferences Given	.180	1.963	<.10
Teaching Quality	-.018	-.216	NS
National Reputation	-.148	-1.569	NS
Time for Degree	.030	.329	NS
Extramural Grants	-.225	-2.067	<.05
Papers Given	.162	1.475	NS
Publications	-.236	-1.822	<.10
(Constant)		4.971	<.001

r_m = .56

Table 200. Regression of Percentage of Time Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Professors' Salary	-.088	-1.503	NS
Resource Adequacy:			
Student RA's	-.028	-.435	NS
Sabbaticals - Research	-.053	-.870	NS
Grant Travel	.012	.196	NS
Computers	.037	.557	NS
Grant Personnel	-.049	-.810	NS
Student TA's	-.082	-1.294	NS
Research - Senior Professors	.281	2.916	<.01
Research Equipment	-.027	-.396	NS
Research - Untenured Profs	-.514	-5.195	<.001
(Constant)		24.231	<.001

r_m = .42

Table 201. Regression of Percentage of Time Spent Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Resource Adequacy - Student TA's	-.140	-3.777	<.001
Professors' Salary	-.056	-1.703	<.10
Resource Adequacy - Library Journals	-.059	-1.809	<.10
Resource Adequacy - Research, Senior Professors	.130	3.191	<.01
Resource Adequacy - Student RA's	.025	.666	NS
Resource Adequacy - Research, Untenured Professors	-.309	-7.467	<.001
(Constant)		37.793	<.001

r_m = .34

Table 202. Regression of Percentage of Time Spent Teaching on Selected Deans' Assessment Variables, Chairs' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	-.137	-2.043	<.05
Teaching Quality	.089	1.754	<.10
Enrollment	.043	.848	NS
Fellowships	-.051	-.989	NS
Courses	-.018	-.342	NS
National Reputation	-.154	-2.705	<.01
Attrition	.172	3.097	<.01
Papers	.296	4.235	<.001
Extramural Grants	-.027	-.430	NS
Publications	-.351	-3.877	<.001
(Constant)		12.714	<.001

$r_m = .51$

Table 203. Regression of Percentage of Time Spent Teaching on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	-.091	-2.261	<.05
Courses	.058	1.816	<.10
Attrition	.017	.576	NS
Teaching Quality	.000	.012	NS
National Reputation	-.124	-3.763	<.001
Papers	.206	5.442	<.001
Extramural Grants	-.089	-2.291	<.05
Publications	-.344	-6.744	<.001
(Constant)		24.853	<.001

$r_m = .46$

Table 204. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Affiliation	.037	.437	NS
Highest Degree Offered	-.422	-3.331	<.01
FTE Faculty - Unit	-.270	-3.363	<.01
FTE Faculty - Institution	-.032	-.249	NS
Total Students	-.064	-.455	NS
Graduate Students	.069	.445	NS
(Constant)		2.816	<.01

$r_m = .55$

Table 205. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	-.023	-.209	NS
Placement	.249	2.779	<.01
Teaching Quality	.050	.595	NS
Degree Time	.003	.029	NS
Professors' Salary	.045	.523	NS
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Institutitional Reputation	.072	.816	NS
Attrition	.031	.348	NS
National Reputation	-.117	-1.238	NS
Papers	.018	.169	NS
Extramural Grants	-.229	-2.015	<.05
Publications	-.290	-2.218	<.05
(Constant)		2.734	<.01

r_m = .56

Table 206. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	-.155	-4.647	<.001
Placement	.000	-.004	NS
Enrollment	.040	1.567	NS
Degree Time	-.025	-.965	NS
Teaching Quality	.387	14.105	<.001
Conferences	.040	1.295	NS
National Reputation	-.148	-5.428	<.001
Attrition	.038	1.356	NS
Courses	-.001	-.041	NS
Student Quality	.033	1.139	NS
Extramural Grants	-.076	-2.404	<.05
Papers	.093	2.486	<.05
Publications	-.282	-6.728	<.001
(Constant)		12.591	<.001

$r_m = .73$

Table 207. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Resource Adequacy - Sabbaticals, Research	-.008	-.135	NS
Resource Adequacy - Student RA's	-.201	-.334	NS
Professors' Salary	-.174	-3.083	<.01
Resource Adequacy - Grant Personnel	-.086	-1.446	NS
Resource Adequacy - Research, Senior Professors	.419	4.460	<.001
Resource Adequacy - Student TA's	-.118	-1.886	<.10
Resource Adequacy - Research, Untenured Professors	-.467	-4.933	<.001
(Constant)		3.110	<.01

$r_m = .40$

Table 208. Regression of Tenure Weight for Teaching on Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Resource Adequacy - Sabbaticals to Improve Teaching	.177	5.803	<.001
Resource Adequacy - Research, Untenured Professors	-.268	-8.556	<.001
Resource Adequacy - Conference Travel	.203	6.301	<.001
(Constant)		22.467	<.001

$r_m = .33$

Table 209. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Graduate Students	-.096	-.522	NS
FTE Faculty - Unit	.134	1.428	NS
FTE Faculty - Institution	.012	.079	NS
Highest Degree Offered	.133	.917	NS
Total Students	.100	.638	NS
(Constant)		6.414	<.001

$r_m = .22$

Table 210. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Professors' Salary and Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessment:			
Research	.148	1.285	NS
Institutional Reputation	-.261	-3.058	<.01
Fellowships	.161	1.788	<.10
Professors' Salary	.052	.592	NS
Deans' Department Assessment:			
Degree Time	-.148	-1.578	NS
Papers	.143	1.328	NS
Extramural Grants	-.007	-.061	NS
Publications	.028	.205	NS
(Constant)		3.412	<.001

$r_m = .48$

Table 211. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	.341	8.797	<.001
Degree Time	-.053	-1.701	<.10
Enrollment	-.046	-1.529	NS
Teaching Quality	-.042	-1.361	NS
Conferences	-.119	-3.283	<.01
National Reputation	.028	.897	NS
Attrition	-.103	-3.205	<.01
Courses	.044	1.361	NS
Extramural Grants	.115	3.112	<.01
Papers	.083	1.909	<.10
Publications	.114	2.356	<.05
(Constant)		18.292	<.001

$r_m = .59$

Table 212. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Resource Adequacy:			
Sabbaticals, Research	.115	1.876	<.10
Grant Travel	.000	.001	NS
Computers	.106	1.608	NS
Professors' Salary	.100	1.720	<.10
Resource Adequacy:			
Student TA's	.021	.351	NS
Research, Senior Professors	-.157	-1.741	<.10
Research Equipment	.017	.245	NS
Research, Junior Professors	.330	3.489	<.001
(Constant)		14.238	<.001

$r_m = .39$

Table 213. Regression of Tenure Weight for Research on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Resource Adequacy:			
Sabbaticals, Research	.065	1.870	<.10
Grant Personnel	.110	3.291	<.01
Professors' Salary	.042	1.221	NS
Resource Adequacy:			
Student RA's	-.032	-.783	NS
Research, Senior Professors	.044	1.012	NS
Research Equipment	-.023	-.615	NS
Student TA's	.083	2.113	<.05
Research, Untenured Professors	.196	4.433	<.001
(Constant)		23.309	<.001

$r_m = .33$

Table 214. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Affiliation	.037	.440	NS
Highest Degree Offered	.172	1.355	NS
FTE Faculty - Unit	.083	1.040	NS
FTE Faculty - Institution	.213	1.692	<.10
Total Students	-.025	-.183	NS
Graduate Students	.224	1.448	NS
(Constant)		10.972	<.001

$r_m = .57$

Table 215. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Professors' Salary and Selected Assessment Variables, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessment:			
Research	.136	1.335	NS
Institutional Reputation	-.088	-1.067	NS
Fellowships	-.174	-2.113	<.05
Attrition	-.079	-.983	NS
Professors' Salaries	.049	.626	NS
Deans' Department Assessment:			
Teaching Quality	-.078	-.979	NS
National Reputation	.032	.355	NS
Degree Time	-.024	-.271	NS
Papers	-.050	-.518	NS
Extramural Grants	.200	1.891	<.10
Publications	.320	2.633	<.01
(Constant)		2.884	<.01

$r_m = .64$

Table 216. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	.126	3.552	<.001
Placement	-.061	-2.167	<.05
Enrollment	-.014	-.514	NS
Degree Time	.007	.265	NS
Teaching Quality	-.098	-3.322	<.001
Conferences	-.040	-1.205	NS
National Reputation	.081	2.803	<.01
Attrition	-.059	-1.999	<.05
Courses	-.054	-1.773	<.10
Student Quality	.002	.053	NS
Extramural Grants	.001	.034	NS
Papers	-.047	-1.181	NS
Publications	.517	11.694	<.001
(Constant)		16.757	<.001

$r_m = .70$

Table 217. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Professors' Salary and Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Chairs' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Resource Adequacy:			
Sabbaticals, Research	.006	.098	NS
Grant Personnel	.047	.807	NS
Computers	.015	.267	NS
Professors' Salary	.181	3.229	<.01
Resource Adequacy:			
Student TA's	.013	.231	NS
Grant Travel	-.044	-.718	NS
Research, Senior Professors	-.185	-1.974	<.05
Research, Untenured Professors	.506	5.266	<.001
(Constant)		13.699	<.001

$r_m = .44$

Table 218. Regression of Tenure Weight for Publishing on Selected Resource Adequacy Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Resource Adequacy:			
Sabbaticals, Teaching	-.201	-6.306	<.001
Research, Untenured Professors	.232	5.527	<.001
Student TA's	.042	1.289	NS
Research, Senior Professors	.043	1.044	NS
(Constant)		18.579	<.001

r_m = .30

Table 219. Regression of Deans' Departmental Assessment--Extramural Grants on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Affiliation	.096	1.134	NS
Highest Degree Offered	.000	.006	NS
FTE Faculty - Unit	.047	.597	NS
FTE Faculty - Institution	.193	1.548	NS
Total Students	-.143	-1.028	NS
Graduate Students	.459	2.974	<.01
(Constant)		3.960	<.001

$r_m = .55$

Table 220. Regression of Deans' Departmental Assessment--Publication Rate on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Affiliation	-.079	-1.018	NS
Highest Degree Offered	.132	1.127	NS
FTE Faculty - Unit	.153	2.094	<.05
FTE Faculty - Institution	.212	1.187	<.10
Total Students	.057	.442	NS
Graduate Students	.249	1.725	<.10
(Constant)		6.205	<.001

$r_m = .63$

Table 221. Regression of Deans' Departmental Assessment--Teaching Quality on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Affiliation	.008	.078	NS
Highest Degree Offered	-.049	-.335	NS
FTE Faculty - Unit	-.036	-.401	NS
FTE Faculty - Institution	-.224	-1.542	NS
Total Students	-.129	-.798	NS
Graduate Students	.169	.941	NS
(Constant)		25.263	<.001

$r_m = .26$

Table 222. Regression of Committee Influence on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Graduate Students	-.061	-.341	NS
FTE Faculty - Institution	.059	.418	NS
Highest Degree Offered	-.162	-1.145	NS
Total Students	-.106	-.696	NS
(Constant)		13.813	<.001

$r_m = .26$

Table 223. Regression of Committee Influence on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	.188	5.347	<.001
Student Quality	.031	.829	NS
Institutional Reputation	.015	.490	NS
Fellowships	.006	.175	NS
Courses	-.047	-1.364	NS
Teaching Quality	.314	8.758	<.001
Placement	.128	3.549	<.001
Extramural Grants	-.098	-2.658	<.01
(Constant)		5.130	<.001

r_m = .43

Table 224. Regression of Deans' Impact on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Graduate Students	.099	.555	NS
FTE Faculty - Unit	-.094	-1.043	NS
FTE Faculty - Institution	-.059	-.411	NS
Highest Degree Offered	-.173	-1.221	NS
Total Students	-.109	-.710	NS
(Constant)		14.039	<.001

$r_m = .26$

Table 225. Regression of Deans' Impact of Selected Assessment Variables, Chairs' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	.110	3.390	<.001
Degree Time	.109	3.070	<.01
Teaching Quality	.206	5.785	<.001
Institutional Reputation	.010	.301	NS
Attrition	-.017	-.490	NS
Placement	.084	2.244	<.05
Courses	.061	1.624	NS
Fellowships	-.009	-.230	NS
Student Quality	.083	2.113	<.05
(Constant)		6.894	<.001

$r_m = .39$

Table 226. Regression of Deans' Management Style on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Graduate Students	-.036	-.218	NS
FTE Faculty - Institution	-.054	-.442	NS
Highest Degree Offered	-.123	-.860	NS
(Constant)		23.876	<.001

r_m = .19

Table 227. Regression of Deans' Management Style on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Placement	.118	3.170	<.01
Institutional Reputation	-.010	-.313	NS
Degree Time	.009	.273	NS
Teaching Quality	.253	7.257	<.001
Fellowships	.052	1.429	NS
Courses	.062	1.684	<.10
Student Quality	.056	1.465	NS
(Constant)		6.576	<.001

$r_m = .40$

Table 228. Regression of Deans' Communication with Chairs on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Graduate Students	-.077	-.552	NS
Affiliation	.161	1.716	<.10
FTE Faculty - Institution	.018	.128	NS
Total Students	.186	1.167	NS
(Constant)		24.929	<.001

$r_m = .26$

Table 229. Regression of Deans' Communication with Faculty on Selected Assessment Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Deans' Department Assessments:			
Research	.152	5.035	<.001
Degree Time	.030	.904	NS
Teaching Quality	.320	9.476	<.001
Institutional Reputation	-.029	-.931	NS
Placement	.130	3.671	<.001
Courses	.052	1.489	NS
Fellowships	-.028	-.776	NS
Student Quality	.103	2.795	<.01
(Constant)		.017	NS

$r_m = .48$

Table 230. Regression of Deans' Communication with Faculty on Selected Institutional Characteristics, Deans' Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Highest Degree Offered	-.071	-.683	NS
FTE Faculty - Institution	-.094	-.908	NS
(Constant)		23.734	<.001

$r_m = .15$

Table 231. Regression of Quality of Department Teaching on Selected Communications, Impact, Influence, and Management Style Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Chairs' Communications with Faculty	.123	2.721	<.01
Deans' Impact	.058	1.704	<.10
Influence of Committees	.161	5.145	<.001
Deans' Management Style	-.009	-.212	NS
Chairs' Impact	.127	3.723	<.001
Deans' Communications with Faculty	.018	.408	NS
Chairs' Management Style	.059	1.296	NS
(Constant)		28.492	<.001

$r_m = .36$

Table 232. Regression of Quality of Department Research on Selected Communications, Impact, Influence, and Management Style Variables, Faculty Sample

Variables	Beta	T	Statistical Significance
Chairs' Communications with Faculty	.062	1.317	NS
Deans' Impact	.036	1.026	NS
Committee Influence	.135	4.161	<.001
Chairs' Impact	.063	1.776	<.10
Deans' Communications with Faculty	.025	.716	NS
Chairs' Management Style	.031	.670	NS
(Constant)		14.872	<.001

r_m = .24